"The Originals"
The 1888-89 New Zealand Native Football Team in Britain, Australia and New Zealand.

A thesis

submitted in partial fulfilment

of the requirements for the Degree

of

Master of Arts in History

in the

University of Canterbury

by

G.J. Ryan

University of Canterbury

1992

CONTENTS

ILLUSTRATIONS

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

During the last two years I have accumulated a large number of academic and personal debts. I am particularly grateful to Jock Phillips and the Historical Branch, Department of Internal Affairs, for a research bursary which made my visit to Britain and the overall production of this thesis so much easier. Rod Chester did not hesitate in answering a multitude of obscure questions and supplied me with much useful material from his own research into the history of New Zealand rugby - especially biographical details of the Native team. Special thanks are due to Luke Trainor whose insight concerning structures and general themes was of great assistance when I began writing. Thanks also to Chris Connolly and Vincent Orange for ideas and references.

For their help in obtaining hundreds of newspaper volumes, not all of them readily accessible, I owe much to the staffs of the University of Canterbury Library, the Canterbury Public Library, the Hocken Library, Dunedin, the National Library and Parliamentary Library in Wellington, and especially the British Library Newspaper Library, Colindale. The invaluable

photographs were kindly provided by the New Zealand Rugby Museum, Palmerston North.

My greatest debts are to the people who have lived through my demands, eccentricities and frustrations during the last two years. My family have provided constant encouragement and assistance and kept me fed, financed and mellow in London and Palmerston North respectively. In Christchurch I have leant on a lot of wonderful people, enjoyed many superb coffee breaks and a great deal of much needed reassurance. Deepest thanks to Liz, Nic, Brent, Annelies, Dave, Sue, Tim and Janet. Now you can all relax!!

Two people in particular have kept me moving in the right direction. I can never say enough about the support and friendship of Barb Chinn who has always understood the complex life of a thesis writer and new computer user. I sincerely hope you can find a use for your newly acquired knowledge of rugby, ginger nuts and student scandal. Above all, thanks to my supervisor, Len Richardson, who first alerted me to the potential of the Native tour and has always given me the advice and confidence to keep going and develop my ideas. I trust that we will continue to uncover the intrigues of sports history and short sentences.

ABSTRACT

This thesis operates on two levels. Firstly, it is an account of the origins, composition and experiences of the predominantly Maori New Zealand Native football team in Britain, Australia and New Zealand during 1888-89. Secondly, it uses the main themes and incidents of the tour as a basis to examine some aspects of the interaction between race, class, imperialism and sport during the late nineteenth century - both within Britain and in her colonies. Patterns emerge which question existing interpretations as to the diffusion and strength of an elite British ethos which linked sport to higher social and political ideals and to the maintenance of imperial objectives.

The thesis is divided into six chapters. The first two trace the composition of the team, motives for the tour and initial responses to it in New Zealand. The wider focus is on a set of colonial aspirations which saw the tour as having an important bearing, positive or otherwise, on British perception of the fledgling New Zealand colony. Points are also raised concerning the relationship between Maori and European in this process. Chapters three, four and five, covering the tour of Britain, are primarily based around a dichotomy between elite and working class interests which is revealed in contrasting

responses to a predominantly Maori team and to its behaviour both on and off the sports field. An assessment is made of the suspect motives of those who controlled and financed the tour, and comparisons are also made with the 1868 Aboriginal cricket team to Britain. The final chapter and Conclusion challenge standard interpretations of the Native team and consider its wider value as an indicator of new perspectives on the study of sports history.

Research is based very largely on newspaper sources. More than seventy publications, both metropolitan and provincial, have been consulted in Britain, Australia and New Zealand.

PREFACE

Until fairly recent times, and still in some quarters, the idea of devoting academic enquiry to a sports tour has been viewed less than seriously. Mere games, it is held, possess no meaning beyond the arenas in which they are played - other than a superficial concern with performances and results. To the contrary, however, it can easily be demonstrated that as a variety of sports were taken from their crude folk forms to a high state of formalisation during the second half of the nineteenth century, many of those involved in the process, whether as players or administrators, interpreted ideals and objectives far beyond the gestures of the field. Evidence abounds that the reformers of the English public school system, in particular, saw sport in an increasingly important role as a training for life and a test of character. Participation in games, and especially team games, fostered the sort of discipline, cooperation and conformity that many regarded as essential to the efficient running of Britain's growing Empire.

Moving beyond this elite ideal, but on similar principles, the working class of northern England and Wales especially, came to embrace organised sport as a vital community focus - as a yardstick by which neighbouring towns or villages could test

individual and collective virility. Similarly, in the expanding colonies of Empire, effective participation in sport was increasingly taken as a sign that those on the "frontiers" had not deteriorated in hostile environments or among hostile peoples and were still worthy representatives of the Mother Country. Also, if sport could be encouraged among the indigenous people of the colonies, processes of government would be greatly assisted through the forging of common bonds and customs, such as happened in India and the West Indies. But whether the ideals were successfully translated at all levels is a matter very much open to debate and interpretation.

With these very general principles in mind, a study of the 1888-89 New Zealand Native Football Representatives begins to make sense. On the one hand, it is the aim of this thesis to provide basic details which will recover the exploits of the team from their previous anecdotal obscurity. The wider purpose, however, is to set reactions to the tour in the context of a number of distinct and frequently disparate nineteenth century interpretations of race, class, "morality" and imperial relationships as they were expressed through sport. Within this model the tour will be seen to both conform to certain prevailing scholarly views and pose important questions as to the accuracy of others.

But the extent of such conclusions is at all times bound by a sparsity of sources concerning the tour. Very little has emerged from the players involved, and, as will be explained in chapter three and the bibliographical notes, there were important practical and ideological constraints which determined the nature and extent of press coverage of the tour

in both Britain and New Zealand. Yet as research for this thesis is primarily based upon an examination of more than seventy different newspapers in Britain, Australia and New Zealand, including both metropolitan and provincial publications, it is quite legitimate to draw solid conclusions from omissions. What the press in some parts of Britain chose to ignore, as contrasted with other sources in London and New Zealand, will frequently be shown as a parallel with broader issues of class and ideology.

As a starting point, the timing of the Native tour, 1888-89, is significant. Although it can not be denied that New Zealand possessed an increasing economic value to Britain, the colonial perspective was that they had yet to make their own particularly discernible contribution to Empire - and especially in the military sphere. Moreover this was not to occur until the Boer War or perhaps the First World War. Many were the politicians, editors and ordinary people of New Zealand during the 1880s who expressed a desire to prove the qualities of the colony and to demonstrate that its character conformed to the established pattern. Implicit, of course, was a desire to eradicate or downplay those elements which did not meet this standard. Thus, while chapters one and two are necessarily concerned in large part with the origins, objectives and composition of the Native tour, they also offer important perspectives on colonial aspirations. The fact that this was the first tour by a New Zealand sports team to Britain raised a number of important concerns in terms of the impression it would convey at "Home". Especially was this so when it became apparent that the motives and conduct of the

tour were not entirely in accordance with an official rugby ethos which sought to civilise the colonial game along public school lines. Moreover, that the Native team was a combination of full blooded Maori, part Maori ("half-caste") and European also elicited some intriguing distinctions from the press and public in New Zealand.

But the early stages of the Native tour of Britain reveal that questions must be asked as to the currency of such thought - whether or not the quality of the colony, its racial balance and its place within Empire figured high in the consciousness of the British public. Both sides of this argument will be broached in chapter three. On the one hand it will clarify the place of the Native tour within certain elitist conceptions of sport and imperialism, and sport as a vehicle for assimilation. At the same time a context will be offered for elements of Victorian race commentary and response which arose from first contacts with the team. But against this, the tour can be used as a basis for challenging the wider application of such views of race and imperialism. Did they have any relevance to working class communities in the north of England and in Wales? And if not, why not? Essential to this discussion, and a valuable reference point for the thesis as a whole, is to compare the experiences of the 1868 Aboriginal cricket tour of Britain - the first "colonial" touring team in any sport, and the only "native" team to be adequately documented.

It is important, though, that these wider interpretations do not obscure the impact of the tour on those who participated. At fourteen months duration and 107 matches the Native tour is certain to remain unchallenged in the annals of

international sporting endeavour. Yet, as will be demonstrated in chapter four, the human cost of such an immense undertaking does not reflect favourably on those who promoted the tour. Several questions must be asked; why did the promoters go to the lengths that they did?; and by what means did they maintain the controls necessary to achieve their objectives? This can only be understood properly in relation to a survey of late nineteenth century sports tours and the precedents they established both on and off the playing fields.

Returning to the themes of image and conduct, the tour of Britain can be used as a microcosm for discussing various divisions of class and interpretation in the development of organised sport. From the Native team's earliest days in Britain their playing methods and their general conduct drew substantially contrasting reactions from traditional elements of the British sporting elite and the newer converts to their games - especially those in the north of England. For as much as there was structural progress, there also remained a great deal of fluidity in the late nineteenth century sporting world. In Britain, during the 1880s, issues of amateurism and professionalism, and related connotations as to playing methods and objectives, were running deeply into conflict - but nevertheless remaining unresolved. Only in the mid 1890s, when a split occurred between rugby and professional northern union, the forerunner to rugby league, and the modern Olympic movement was developed as a bastion of amateurism, did options for players and administrators in various sports become much clearer. In the meantime the Native team and many others trod a fine line of uncertainty - clearly at odds

with the elite governing bodies of sport, but lacking viable alternatives. Chapter five will examine the origin and form of the views expressed by these two groups, the wider themes each embodied, and highlight certain of the contradictions in their expression. As a vital corollary, one must consider the effectiveness, or otherwise, with which the elite ideal was transplanted to the game of rugby in New Zealand during its formative years. For the departure of the Native team in August 1888 came only eighteen years after the first game under rugby rules in the colony had been played at Nelson College. Under the watchful eye of such public school old boys as Charles Monro and George Sale, Professor of Classics at the University of Otago, a game of few conventions and a reputation for on field savagery and off field excess had been codified and progressively "civilised". Between 1879 and 1889 fourteen provincial rugby union's were established and the combined New Zealand Rugby Football Union was to follow in 1893. Yet questions remain, epitomised by the approach of the Native team, as to the speed and thoroughness of this transformation.

Within an account of the later stages of the tour in Australia and New Zealand, chapter six offers explanations as to why the Native team has assumed such a low profile in New Zealand sport and history. A revealing comparison is also provided with the performances of the widely acclaimed 1905 and 1924 All Black touring teams; a comparison which, when combined with the realities of various responses outlined in previous chapters, sets the worth of the Native team much higher than has previously been allowed. Moreover, as in the title of this

thesis, it redesignates "The Originals" - a description which has commonly been given to the 1905 All Black team to Britain.

CHAPTER ONE

Finding a Winning Formula: Origins and Composition of the Native Team.

Based only on standard accounts one could be forgiven for thinking that the exploits of the New Zealand Native team were nothing more than a rugby circus characterised by frivolity and eccentricity. In the absence of readily accessible facts, their story has become one of anecdotal sensationalism which, in its almost exclusive focus on the controversial or unusual has served only to trivialise the venture. Yet when plans for a tour of Britain were first announced in the summer of 1888, the reaction was anything but lighthearted. As the team was assembled, and its motives emerged as an ambiguous blend of sport and speculation, serious concerns were expressed as to the character of those involved and the impact the tour would have. The New Zealand provincial rugby union's in particular saw the privately organised Native team as a direct threat to their increasing attempts to standardise and control the game. While echoing these concerns, the press also raised the wider issue of the impression the tourists would create at "Home" in Britain and whether their conduct would convey an appropriate view of the young colony. Added to this was the composition of the party - a mixture of Maori and European - at a time when respective qualities and prospects for interaction between the two were a matter for wide

ranging debate. Rather than being an amusing sideshow, the Native team induced a reaction far beyond the confines of rugby games and those who watched them. Yet to appreciate properly these issues as they emerged in the and early stages of the tour, one must begin with a single player - Joseph Astbury Warbrick.

Warbrick was unquestionably the founding father of the Native tour. Born at Rotorua in 1862 to a Maori mother and European father, he attended St Stephen's Native School until 1877 - the same year in which he made his provincial rugby debut as Auckland full-back at the age of fifteen. During the 1879 and 1880 seasons he represented Wellington before reappearing in the Auckland teams of 1882 and 1883. Following his fine achievements during the tour of the first New Zealand team to Australia in 1884, Warbrick represented Hawkes Bay in 1885, Auckland in 1886 and Hawkes Bay again in 1887. Widely praised for his speed, ball skills and drop-kicking, his abilities were matched by few in the colony and only by Jack Taiaroa ,of Otago, among Maori players. S.E. Sleigh, manager of the New Zealand team in Australia, described Warbrick in 1885 as " a player without a vestige of funk; he will dash at an opponent at full speed and collar him, very fast and an untiring individual ".[1]

At the beginning of 1888 it appears that Warbrick was still resident in Hawkes Bay. Standard interpretations, such as that by Winston McCarthy, suggest that his inspiration to organise

---

[1] R.H. Chester & N.A.C. McMillan, The Encyclopedia of New Zealand Rugby, Auckland 1981, p.206; I. Hunter, Rugby Football: Some Hints and Criticisms, Auckland 1929, p,10.

the New Zealand Native tour derived from R.L. Seddon's British team which visited New Zealand in 1888. Warbrick, making a guest appearance for the Wellington team, is reported to have taken much heart from their 3-all draw with the visitors on 14 May and immediately set about assembling a team for England.[2] However, it is quite apparent that his plans and confidence were born long before this match and long before the arrival of the British team in New Zealand. In a letter circulated to the press in early February 1888 he announced his intention to select a team of Maori or part-Maori players to meet the British team when they arrived in April. Moreover he held no doubts as to the success of such a team.

> [I] am anxious to select the very best men I can .... We will be able to muster a really fist-class team, and I feel convinced we could render a good account of ourselves .... I m not sure of the balance, but anticipate that when complete they would be good enough for anything in New Zealand.

Players in Wairarapa and Taranaki had already been contacted, Jack Taiaroa was endeavouring to secure the services of his brother Dick as well as the Wellington players David Gage and Tom Ellison. Warbrick, himself, was in the process of contacting the Wynyard brothers of Auckland along with other players in the Thames district. He hoped that the match would be played at Auckland where the potential for good gate receipts would cover the high costs involved.[3]

By early March, however, the single Auckland match had evolved into far more grandiose plans. In an interview with

---

2 W. McCarthy, Haka: The All Black Story, London 1968, pp.14-20; Haka: The Maori Rugby Story, Auckland 1983, p.65. See also G. Dixon, The Triumphant Tour of the New Zealand Footballers, Wellington 1906, p.10.

3 *Canterbury Times,* 17 February 1888, p.15.

The New Zealand Referee, given while he was passing through Christchurch in search of suitable players, Warbrick announced that the British team would only be played if suitable terms could be arranged regarding the division of gate money. More significantly, he said that although plans to take a team to Sydney had been abandoned, he would take one to Britain if a preliminary tour of New Zealand proved successful.[4]

It is therefore certain that plans for a tour were well known in New Zealand rugby circles long before the arrival of Seddon's British team. Warbrick was subsequently to claim that for several years he had been pressed to form a team " that would do for Maori football what the Australians have done for Australian cricket and make it famous ",[5] - although he did not reveal who had "pressed" him to do this or whether his reference was to the white Australians or Aboriginal touring team. It was also reported that the Rugby Football Union, in England, had done much to foster interest in the tour after it had first been suggested to them, by S.E. Sleigh, in October 1887.[6] In fact the Union extended its patronage to the tour as early as April 1888 - again, long before its proceedings were widely known in New Zealand.[7]

Quite coincidently, at the same time as Warbrick was revealing his plans in New Zealand, similar ideas were emerging from another source - Thomas Eyton. Born in Essex in 1843, Eyton came to New Zealand in 1862 and served with the

---

4 *The New Zealand Referee*, 9 March 1888, pp.188-9.
5 *The sporting Life*, 27 September 1888, p.4. See also *The Sportsman*, 10 October 1888, p.4.
6 *The Times*, 4 October 1888, p.8; *The New Zealand Referee*, 9 March 1888, pp.188-9.
7 *Canterbury Times*, 20 April 1888, p.14.

Taranaki Bushrangers and the Patea Light Horse in the Anglo-Maori wars until 1869. During the following two years he served with the Armed Constabulary in Wanganui before shifting to Wellington for a job in Treasury. His rugby experience consisted mainly of appearances for the Armed Constabulary and for Civil Service teams in Wellington.[8]

In 1887, while in England for jubilee year, Eyton witnessed a number of important rugby matches - especially at the Rectory Field, Blackheath. "It seemed to me ", he later wrote in his tour book, " that the play I saw was not vastly superior to that I had seen in New Zealand and that if a team from this colony - especially Maoris or half-castes - could be taken to England and brought to up-to-date form, such a venture would prove a success in every respect ".[9] Why Eyton expressed a specific interest in Maori players and what he meant by "success in every respect" will be discussed later.

How or when Warbrick and Eyton became aware of each others' plans is not known. Nor can it be determined upon whose initiative Sleigh made his approach to the Rugby Football Union. Eyton's only recollection is that upon hearing of Warbrick's plans he immediately entered into correspondence and after an initial period of doubt as to whether the necessary players and finance could be secured it was decided to proceed with the tour. At some time during April or May 1888, James Scott, a publican from Gisborne,was also added to the partnership - although his connection to the

---

[8] T. Eyton, Rugby Football Past and Present, Palmerston North 1896, p.5; McCarthy, Maori Rugby Story, p.67; Chester & McMillan, Encyclopedia, p,280.
[9] Eyton, Rugby Football, pp.5-6.

other two is again uncertain. Warbrick was to act as team captain, Scott as manager and Eyton as promoter and treasurer.[10]

With the impetus of the British tour discounted, and Eyton's very brief summary revealing little of substance, one is left without an obvious springboard for the tour. In the first instance, some place must be allowed for purely sporting objectives. For although recorded and collected evidence is sparse, it is quite apparent that some Maori were making a distinct contribution to New Zealand rugby by the 1880s. Although exclusively Maori clubs were formed, such as the Hauraki Club at Kiri Kiri in 1883, the prevailing tendency seems to have been to merge with European teams. Individuals can certainly be found in teams throughout the 1870s. One Wirihana appeared in a twenty-a-side encounter at Aramoho on 22 June 1872, Takeru in the Rangitikei team of 1876 and two Taiaroa brothers in the Otago High School Rectory team of 1878. At the highest level Joe Warbrick and Jack Taiaroa ensured a Maori presence in the first New Zealand touring team which visited New South Wales in 1884.[11]

As with the major early growth of the European game, some of this involvement may be traced to schools. Among larger Maori establishments, such as St Stephen's Native School and Te Aute College, a high standard of rugby was certainly in evidence from the early 1880s. Under the administration of John Thornton (1878-1910), Te Aute was an environment in

---

10 Ibid.

11 G. Slatter, On the Ball, Christchurch 1870, p.61; J.O.C. Phillips, A Man's Country, Auckland 1987, p.88; S. O'Hagan, The Pride of Southern Rebels, Dunedin 1981, p.14; Chester & McMillan, Encyclopedia, p.378.

which many of the athletic and social values of the English public school system were imparted to young Maori. Indeed Reweti Kohere, a pupil at Te Aute during the 1880s, echoed common sentiments when he defended rugby against accusations of roughness by informing his critic that " it was essential and natural for the young to indulge in some wholesome form of sport ".[12] At a lower level, although there is again a lack of conclusive evidence, it is likely that many of the smaller Native Schools were also quite deliberate in seeking to channel the energies of their pupils to football of one form or another.

Of the 21 players of Maori extraction who ultimately toured in the New Zealand Native team, it is revealing that six attended Te Aute College, one was a founder pupil of Christchurch Boys' High School and Joe Warbrick attended St Stephen's. His four brothers and the three Wynyard brothers may also have been influenced in their rugby by time at various well established native schools in Auckland and Tauranga.[13] Thus, while schools are unlikely to have been the only growth point for Maori rugby, their influence in terms of those who pursued the game at a higher level appears considerable.

With this network, and his own diverse provincial rugby experience, Warbrick was in a better position than almost anyone to assess available Maori talent and prospects for a

---

[12] T. Ellison, The Art of Rugby Football, Wellington 1902, pp.61f; R.T. Kohere, Autobiography of a Maori, Wellington 1951, p.65.

[13] K. Tyro & K. Scarlett, Eds., Te Aute College 125th Anniversary 1854-1979, Pukehou 1979, pp.17f; *The Press*, 10 April 1954, p.8; Chester & McMillan, Encyclopedia, p.206; *New Zealand Herald*, 21 May 1940..

tour. It is quite plausible to imagine that, having toured with the New Zealand team, he was captivated by the idea of taking a team representing his own people on a tour to the home of rugby. Furthermore, there certainly existed a precedent for international touring teams of other kinds - and one of which Warbrick had displayed an awareness. For in his intention to place Maori rugby on a level akin to Australian cricket, there is implicit an acknowledgement of a well established interchange between England and Australia dating back to the 1860s. There was an English cricket team in Australia for some part of every year from 1881 to 1888, and the gesture was reciprocated at two yearly intervals from 1878 - with the Australian "Ashes" victory of 1882 being a particularly notable achievement. In rugby circles, aside from the 1884 tour, New South Wales had visited New Zealand in 1882 and 1886.[14]

Few New Zealanders, of course, had the recent experience of British rugby to substantiate comparisons. Indeed the optimistic prediction Warbrick had made when first announcing the tour to the New Zealand press, in February 1888, appears rather inflated when it is realised that no representative Maori team of any description had been selected prior to this time[15] and only eight of the players who appear on Warbrick's list of 22 for the proposed Auckland

---

[14] K.S. Inglis, " Imperial Cricket: Test matches between Australia and England 1877-1900 ", in R. Cashman & M. McKernan, Eds., Sport in History, St Lucia 1979, pp.162-80; R.H. Chester & N.A.C. McMillan, The Visitors: The History of International Rugby Teams in New Zealand, Auckland 1990, pp.17-28.

[15] While a Maori XV played an unofficial match against Australia at Rotorua on 13 September 1905, the first fully representative New Zealand Maori team was not selected until 1910. Chester & McMillan, Encyclopedia, p.347.

match, or who subsequently embarked with the Native team, had any previous experience of provincial rugby.[16] Yet for want of evidence to the contrary, there are no documented grounds to suggest that Warbrick's initial motive was anything other than a sporting one.

However, when Eyton's account of the tour is examined in more detail, the lack of precedent for a representative Maori team assumes some importance and the idea of a sporting objective becomes rather distorted. Firstly, when discussing the question of jurisdiction for the tour, Eyton defensively claims that it was a private venture conducted in spite of the New Zealand provincial rugby union's who, he said, insisted that no team should travel unless under their management.[17] The administrative structure of the game during the 1880s undoubtedly lent itself more readily to such private arrangements. With the New Zealand Rugby Football Union not being formed until 1892, there existed a certain level of inefficiency and even acrimony in relations between the various provincial bodies. Thus greater opportunities and justifications existed for those willing to transcend establishment boundaries and arrange touring teams. Indeed Eyton seems quite justified in declaring that private individuals who guaranteed more than £2000 in initial capital for a tour were entitled to have a major stake in the selection and management of the team.[18]

---

16 A.C. Swan, " Makers of History: The 1888-89 N.Z. Native Team ", *Silver Fern*, 1,8,15,22 July 1965; W.A. Reed, 100 Years of Rugby, Nelson 1969, p.55; Chester & McMillan, Encyclopedia, pp.67,76,206,222.

17 Eyton, Rugby Football, pp.5-6.

18 Ibid, p.6.

Yet when set in context, his criticism of the provincial union's and their attitude to the Native tour appears somewhat manufactured. The fact that provincial sides were fielded against the Native team prior to its departure from New Zealand, and that the team was assisted by a significant share of gate receipts from these matches, implies, at the very least, a toleration of the tour on the part of the union's. Furthermore, as will be explained later, it was only when European players were added to an essentially Maori team that the question of jurisdiction over it arose.

Why Eyton should depict the union's as hostile is a matter revealed in several factors which combine to demonstrate that his own objective for the tour was almost entirely financial. And it was to obscure this fact that he presented himself to posterity as an innovator battling against an obstructive establishment. The essential starting point for such a judgement is Eyton's failure, in any context, to explain why he desired a specifically Maori team. His knowledge of Maori playing strength was vastly inferior to that of Warbrick, as indicated by his non-involvement in the selection of the team,[19] and his emphasis on only Maori players automatically precluded any notion of a fully representative team to enhance the reputation of the colony in Britain.

Certainly his plan was in some part based on an appeal to sporting enthusiasts. But its execution by the native inhabitants of New Zealand added a dimension to capture a much wider section of British public interest. For fascination

---

[19] Ibid. He did not meet Warbrick or the team until they reached Christchurch in July.

with indigenous representatives of the colonies was well documented during the nineteenth century, and profit from them was not without precedent. A direct parallel to the Native tour was the visit of an Aboriginal cricket team to England in 1868. Organised and captained by Charles Lawrence, a member of the first English team to Australia in 1861-62, the party won fourteen and drew eighteen of its 47 matches on a five month tour. While their cricket was collectively not of a high standard, the team quickly won a following for their athletic prowess and weapons displays. Team members regularly won throwing competitions and races against professional sprinters and one player, Dick-a-Dick, constantly amazed spectators with his ability to fend off a number of simultaneously and forcefully thrown cricket balls from his body using only a club and a thin shield. Mainly as a consequence of these popular exhibitions, the promoters of the tour were rewarded with a handsome profit.[20]

Aside from the reaction accorded various Maori visitors to Britain during this period, which will be examined in chapter three, there is little to be gained from pursuing further the comparison with the Aboriginal cricketers. This is especially so because it is nowhere clear that Eyton was even aware of the Aboriginal tour. Suffice it to say, however, that during his visit to Britain in 1887 he is certain to have gauged thoroughly the likely response to such a venture before proposing it in New Zealand and commiting his finances to it.

---

[20] J. Mulvaney & R. Harcourt, Cricket Walkabout, Rev. Ed., London 1986, pp.174-82,120-8,191-5.

The nature of motives for the tour derives its greatest clarity from the sometimes heated discussion and negotiation which developed between a number of parties seeking to procure a stake in proceedings prior its departure from New Zealand. In early May 1888 Warbrick announced that he would have no problem securing preliminary finance for the tour. One gentleman, probably Eyton, had offered £2000 and £3000 could have been secured in Auckland alone.[21] Another with a strong desire to become involved was a Mr Brown of Christchurch. From references in two letters by Arthur Shrewsbury, the noted English cricketer and promoter of the British touring team, it appears that in a meeting with Warbrick, probably in early May, Brown offered to put £400 into the venture provided that certain conditions were met. Having been declined, he then attempted to gain leverage by indicating support for a proposal by members of the British team to take their own New Zealand tour back to Britain on terms acceptable to players who were, he said, dissatisfied with the terms offered by Warbrick. Finally, when Warbrick still refused his offer, Brown moved, in jealousy, to assist critics of the tour - although this matter will be discussed in another context.[22]

Two other indicators of speculation emerge from quite different sources. The first can be found in Warbrick's visit to the Wairarapa at the beginning of March 1888. While some local players expressed an interest in playing against the

---

21 *The New Zealand Referee*, 4 May 1888, p.283.

22 A. Shrewsbury, letters to Mr Turner, 15 May/3 June 1888, from Letter Book - photocopy in possession of R.H. Chester. Shrewsbury expressed his own regret at not making an offer to Warbrick while he was in New Zealand.

British at Auckland, the idea of a tour was not greeted with enthusiasm. Many were sceptical about Warbrick's willingness to accept part Maori players and felt that only full blooded Maori would be an effective drawcard in England.[23] Here, the reference is clearly not one related to playing strength in that a team composed of full blooded Maori would have even less justification in rugby terms than that which Warbrick proposed. Indeed, only Rene and Taiaroa of the full blooded Maori players in the Native team had any previous provincial experience.[24] The concern voiced most loudly in the Wairarapa was more obviously that if the team did not present the appearance and character of true Maori, then they would not attract the interest of the British public.

The speculative aspect of the tour was also discussed in parliament. In a question to the Minister of Public Works asking whether the Native team was to be given free rail travel while in New Zealand, William Pember Reeves, himself a noted sporting identity, declared that it was widely understood that the tour was merely a speculation and that the team was neither truly native nor representative.[25]

Final evidence of speculation will only emerge in subsequent chapters when the structure of the tour and its impact on the players is examined in greater detail. For the moment, however, it can be said that in Eyton's summary of tour matches, and more especially in Scott's frequent comments to the London correspondent of the *Lyttelton Times*, numerous

---

23 *Canterbury Times*, 16 March 1888, p.16.
24 See Appendix one.
25 *New Zealand Parliamentary Debates*, 1888, Vol.63, p.155.

Joe Warbrick

NEW ZEALAND TEAM, 1884.

Back Row.—O'Donnell, Udy, Robertson, Allan, E. Millton, Ryan, Wilson. Second Row.—Davy, Taiaroa, Carter, Dimdell, W. Millton (Captain), Braddon, Helmore, Webb, Sleigh (Manager). Front Row.—Lecky, Warbrick, Roberts, T. O'Connor (absent).

references can be found to financial proceedings - such things as gate receipts, travel and accommodation costs and shortfalls caused by the free admission of spectators to some matches. All of these areas were to cause Scott and Eyton much greater concern than would seem appropriate to sports promoters in search of a satisfactory break even point.

To some extent a shift from sporting to fiscal objectives was a necessary concession. For without an initial capital outlay, and regular income from gate receipts thereafter, Warbrick's plans could never have become reality. Yet the underpinning to much of what follows lies in determining extents and priorities in the interaction of these two forces - the requirements of the players as against the need or desire of the promoters to make money. Implicit is a question as to the balance of control between Eyton, Scott and Warbrick.

Initially one would assume that those who held the purse strings held sway. However, when contrasted with Eyton's earlier comments concerning initial financial doubts and difficulties over the tour, Warbrick's claims that there were many willing speculators suggest that he possessed a quite flexible bargaining position - one in which he was able to choose his partners on terms satisfactory to his own objectives for the tour. While a number of parties expressed interest, apparently only Scott and Eyton offered an acceptable proposition. Yet as events unfolded, a severe foot injury to Warbrick greatly restricted his role as a player and increasingly shifted his focus to management and other off field aspects of the tour. Thus it will become clear that while Eyton and Scott represented the financial angle of the Native

tour, it is by no means certain that the captain of the team ultimately retained an interest only in the playing angle.

But having said this, there is much in the early months of 1888 to suggest that Warbrick's overriding concern in assembling the Native team was to provide a powerful on field combination. For unlike Lawrence, who drew his Aboriginal team from a small district of Western Victoria and included perhaps only five genuine cricketers among its fourteen members, Warbrick cast his net from Hokianga to Southland in search of suitable players. One can assume that for a player of his ability, pride was an important factor in this exercise. If representatives of the Maori people were to be presented before the sporting public of Britain, all steps possible should be taken to present the most favourable impression. Yet an essential component of using sport as a speculation, or just to pay its way, was its ability to draw spectators through the turnstiles. If the Native team had performed poorly and established a reputation as easybeats, their attraction to the sporting public would have diminished. Although a group of Maori would still attract the curious gaze in the streets of Britain, profit could only be turned in the controlled environment of a sports ground where spectators saw some reason to pay for their pleasure. As has been shown on many occasions during the present century, unsuccessful or uninspiring sports teams do not attract public interest or pocket. The contrast with Lawrence's lopsided selection policy is that cricket, far more than rugby, is a game in which a small number of talented individuals can more easily cover for the performances of others.

As with most aspects of the pre-tour arrangements, the selection process of the team is obscure. Eyton makes no comment other than expressing doubts concerning finance and player availability, and he seems to have played no part in the selection process. Indeed, he conducted all initial business with Scott and Warbrick by letter and did not finally meet the team until it reached Christchurch in July.[26] But his hint at selection difficulties is confirmed by a comparison of the players chosen for the proposed Auckland match against the British and those who subsequently toured. Of the 22 players named by Warbrick in March, only eleven made it to Britain. Of those who withdrew, three came from Southland and five from the Wairarapa where opposition to Warbrick's inclusion of other than full blooded Maori players has already been noted.[27] By far the greatest loss from the original selection was Jack Taiaroa who declined a tour place due to university commitments.[28]

Thus Warbrick's final selection was somewhat weaker than originally intended - although it was not without credentials. The most obvious point is the inclusion of four of Warbrick's brothers - William, Alfred, Arthur and Frederick. Some of these choices could perhaps be construed as an expedient. Yet William (Billy) Warbrick was a player of proven ability having gained selection for Bay of Plenty combined Clubs in 1882 and for Auckland in 1886. He also appears in the first selection for the Auckland match. Alf and Arthur Warbrick

---

26 Eyton, Rugby Football, p.6.

27 Figures are derived from *The New Zealand Referee*, 9 March 1888, p.188.

28 McCarthy, Maori Rugby Story, p.63.

were regular players for the Matata club, and the potential of the youngest brother, Fred, can be gauged from his fine performances in Britain and subsequent appearances for Queensland during the 1890s.[29]

Close family and playing links also point to the inclusion of several other team members. Warbrick's letter to the press in mid February reveals that Jack Taiaroa was instrumental in persuading his brother, Dick, and his cousin, Tom Ellison, to join the team. The younger Taiaroa had acquired his initial rugby training during his time at Christchurch Boys' High School and had represented Wellington in 1886 and 1887.[30] Ellison had been a distinguished player at Te Aute College and a regular member of the Wellington team since 1885. From Ellison's Poneke club, and therefore most probably at his instigation, came David Gage - a Wellington representative since 1887. Auckland's North Shore club provided the second set of brothers in the team - the Wynyard's - George (Sherry), Henry (Pie) and William (Tabby). Pie Wynyard was not an original tour selection, having gone to England on his own business early in 1888 and subsequently joining the team at Newcastle. Tabby Wynyard had represented Auckland in 1887, but the other two had no provincial experience prior to the tour. Dick Maynard, another member of the North Shore club without a provincial pedigree, may have gained his tour

---

29 Swan, " Makers of History ", 8 July 1965.
30 A.C. Swan & G.F.W. Jackson, Wellington's Rugby History, Wellington, 1952, p.154.

place on the recommendation of the Wynyard's, although this is far from certain.[31]

Rene, who represented Nelson against New South Wales in 1886 and Wellington in 1887, and Harry Lee, who appeared for Southland in 1887, were the only other members of the Native team to offer a representative record and it was probably this that brought them to Warbrick's attention. Rene's selection also seems to lead to that of another Nelsonian, Wi Karauria, although Arthur Swan records that this player had apparently also impressed in appearances for Nelson club during 1887.[32] Of the six remaining Maori members of the team, it is perhaps significant that three - "Smiler" Ihimaira, Charles Goldsmith (Taare Koropiti) and Wiri Nehua were selected directly from Te Aute College. If they lacked representative credentials, they at least came from the leading Maori rugby school.[33]

Only three players - Anderson[34] and Alexander Webster of Hokianga and Dave Stewart of Thames - can not be placed in some sort of selection pattern. It is evident from Warbrick's February letter that he had visited Thames in search of suitable players, but upon what basis he made his final choices one can not be sure. Suffice it to say, however, that in

---

31 Swan, " Makers of History ", 1 & 8 July 1965; Chester & McMillan, Encyclopedia, pp.67,76,222; *The New Zealand Referee*, 9 March 1888, pp.188-9.

32 Swan, " Makers of History ", 1 & 8 July 1965; Reed, 100 Years of Rugby, p.55.

33 A.C. Swan, History of New Zealand Rugby Football 1870-1945, Wellington 1946, p.519. The names Charles Goldsmith and Taare Koropiti are used in match reports and other references throughout the tour. Goldsmith is the name preferred for this thesis as it is that which was entered on his death certificate at Gisborne, July 1893.

34 Anderson's christian name can not be traced.

these, and indeed all selections, Warbrick's diverse playing experience is certain to have been an overriding element.

In total twenty players were selected for what was originally known as the New Zealand Maori team - the title Native only being adopted after the addition of European players in July. At least five of the team - Ihimaira, Karauria, Nehua, Rene and Taiaroa - were full blooded Maori, while fourteen, including Pie Wynyard, were of European father and Maori mother. The parentage of Anderson (sometimes known as Kiri Kiri) and Goldsmith is unclear, being in part obscured by the tendency among some Maori to adopt Europeanised names during the late nineteenth century.[35]

That at least two thirds of this initial selection were of a European father perhaps offers an insight into the basis of early Maori rugby. With an examination of Warbrick's original Auckland selection revealing that less than half appeared to be full blooded Maori, and five of those from the Wairarapa, it can be argued that a considerable portion of the leading Maori players owed something to a European link. While exclusively Maori clubs did operate, and a number of full blooded Maori undoubtedly participated in European teams, they did not attract significant attention at the highest level. Indeed, that they did not tour in greater numbers, or gain selection for the less demanding Auckland match, and that Warbrick eventually compromised his tour ideal by using European players to strengthen the team, is more a testimony to Maori absence

---

[35] Figures are derived from Appendix 1. Most contemporary accounts state that there were six full blooded Maori and fifteen part Maori - although in view of inaccuracies as to the European component, these figures ought not to be taken at face value.

from these higher playing levels than to a gap in Warbrick's knowledge of the game. Indications are that even with part Maori players the pool of talent was not extensive. Aside from a belated attempt to change the mind of Jack Taiaroa, no similar effort was made to entice any other Maori players or to return to the Wairarapa before the addition of Europeans.[36]

Standard accounts of the tour are unanimous in recording that there were four European players added by Warbrick and that they were an expedient caused by a heavy defeat at Auckland on 7 July. However, there is some disagreement concerning the identity of these players. While all agree that Pat Keogh of Otago and Bill Elliot of Auckland were Europeans, Charles Madigan, Mac McCausland and George Williams are variously listed as European or Maori.[37] Yet biographical evidence leaves no doubt that all three were Europeans thus making their number in the team five instead of four. McCausland's obituary refers to him as one of five Europeans and Elliot, the last survivor of the team. made the same point during a 1954 newspaper interview.[38]

Obviously these selections were an expedient to create a more attractive sporting proposition. It is equally clear that they were not forced upon Warbrick by defeat at Auckland. George Williams, for example, is reported as joining the team on 22 June 1888, one day before the first match in New Zealand and thus before any weakness in the team could have

---

36 *The Press*, 14 July 1888, p.6.

37 See for example, McCarthy, Maori Rugby Story, pp.65-6; Chester & McMillan, Encyclopedia, p.347; Swan, " Makers of History ", 8 July 1965; G. Dixon, The Triumphant Tour, p,10.

38 McCausland obituary, unknown source, Auckland 1936; Elliot interview, *The press*, 11 April 1954, p.16.

been revealed.[39] Similarly, the inclusion of Elliot, Madigan and McCausland, the leading Auckland backs. was announced the day after their provinces' victory against the Native team - suggesting that some prior negotiation had occurred. Indeed McCausland's participation was entirely dependent on his being able to obtain leave from the Bank of New Zealand - a process which is unlikely to have occurred in time for a press statement so soon after the Auckland match.[40] Such timing also allowed Warbrick no time to search beyond Auckland for suitable Maori reinforcements - his haste confirming that perhaps he saw little point in doing so, having already exhausted available Maori talent. Apparently the only player to be approached was John Webster - a European - who had represented Auckland during the early years of the decade. However, he was unable to obtain leave from his position as Town Clerk of Devonport borough and declined a tour place.[41] The final European addition, Pat Keogh, is more easily explained - coming just prior to departure from New Zealand and as a welcome replacement for Joe Warbrick who was badly injured in the Auckland match.

As will be shown later, the addition of European players caused much comment and controversy. But in the first instance they added much needed experience to the Native team. Williams, a policeman, had appeared seven times for Wellington in 1886 and 1887 and once for Hawkes Bay while stationed in Hastings. McCausland, a noted goalkicker, had

---

39 *Canterbury Times*, 22 June 1888, p.14.

40 *The Press*, 10 July 1888, p.5; *Athletic News*, 23 October 1888, p.1..

41 Chester & McMillan, Encyclopedia, p.226. Webster declined a place in the 1884 New Zealand team due to the same work commitments.

represented Auckland in 1886 and made five appearances with Warbrick in the Hawkes Bay side of 1887. Madigan, widely regarded as one of the fastest wingers in New Zealand, had been a regular member of the Auckland side since 1886, and with Elliot he formed a potent backline combination after the latters debut in 1887. Keogh, another to make his representative debut in the 1887 season, quickly established himself as the best half-back in the colony and played a leading role in Otago's close return match with the British team early in 1888.[42]

With the inclusion of Europeans it was necessary to change the designation of the team from New Zealand Maori to New Zealand Native. Eyton justified this on the grounds that all members of the team were New Zealand born - a belief echoed by most subsequent writing on the tour. Evidence from McCausland himself and from Keogh's death certificate confirms, however, that the former was born in Gippsland, Australia and the latter in Birmingham, England.[43] A further possibility that George Williams was also born in England is not confirmed by his death certificate which shows him as being born in Auckland.[44] It is highly doubtful whether Warbrick, Scott and Eyton remained unaware of these details, and especially in the case of McCausland who came to New Zealand as late as 1880. One must therefore regard the title

---

[42] Swan, " Makers of History ", 1 & 8 July 1965; Chester & McMillan, Encyclopedia, pp.224-30.

[43] McCausland obituary, unknown source, Auckland 1936; Death Certificate, P. Keogh, 12 March 1940.

[44] Death Certificate, G. Williams, 27 April 1925.

New Zealand Native team as more of a promotional tool than a genuine attempt to reflect its content.

In its final form the Native team numbered 26 players. Although fairly accurate dates of birth can only be determined for twenty of these, it appears that the average age of the party was 22 or 23, with Williams the oldest at 32 and Webster or Stewart the youngest at 18 or 19.[45] Their motives for joining the tour appear straightforward. It is popularly held, and there is little reason to doubt it, that virtually all of the team were single and "stoney broke" and had little in terms of employment obligations or dependants to keep them in New Zealand.[46] Thus the prospect of adventure on an all expenses paid trip to Britain must have been a great temptation. The possibility also exists, as will be shown later, that some may also have stood to benefit financially from the tour

When it is remembered that modern All Black teams for long tours generally number 30, and that the 1908-09 Australian rugby league team to Britain numbered as many as 34,[47] a touring party of 26, including Joe Warbrick who was injured for most of the tour and Pie Wynyard who did not join until late November, was not a large one. Moreover, the plan for the original party was for an even smaller playing contingent. When interviewed in early May, Warbrick named twenty players as certain to tour and said that he intended adding two

---

[45] See Appendix 1. The average age may have been lower in that three of those for whom no date of birth can be found were selected directly from Te Aute College and would have been about 21 at most.

[46] See for example, R. Palenski, " Native tour grandest of all ", Dominion Sunday Times, 13 October 1988, p.57.

[47] R. Gate, Rugby League: An Illustrated History, London 1989, p.45.

more. By July, with the arrival of four European players and Maynard, and the withdrawal of Jack Taiaroa, Warbrick had settled on 24. With the late addition of Keogh, 25 players left New Zealand in early August 1888.[48]

In part, the assembly of such a small touring party reflected the norm of the period. The New Zealand team to Australia in 1884 numbered nineteen and Seddon's British team for a much longer tour only 21 players.[49] It may also be the case that Warbrick's selection difficulties restricted numbers and that the promoters consciously sought to reduce costs by taking the smallest possible team. By the end of the tour Scott was certainly critical of the inclusion of some players, and suggested that the venture could easily have been conducted with an even smaller group.[50]

In spite of difficulties in its composition, the bulk of the Native team was assembled near Napier, Warbrick's home-town by the beginning of May 1888. Having rented a house and employed a cook, the team spent the majority of their time exercising and training. Some members also made appearances for the Hawkes Bay County Football Club causing objections from the Napier club but not from the Hawkes Bay Rugby Union who declined jurisdiction on the matter.[51] As to the projected itinerary of the tour, it was arranged that the team would travel via Melbourne and Suez to Britain. Thereafter they would undertake a programme of two matches a week for six

---

48 *The Press*, 16 May 1888, p.5; 18 July 1888, p.6.
49 Chester & McMillan, Encyclopedia, pp.378,408.
50 *The Press*, 6 March 1889, p.2.
51 *The New Zealand Referee*, 4 May 1888, p.282; *The Weekly Press*, 8 June 1888, p.697.

months before returning to Australia for further matches in May 1889.[52]

In the eyes of Warbrick, Scott and Eyton the Native team contained an ideal balance for what lay ahead. As a playing attraction they possessed both a core of experienced and talented provincial players and a number of others with a respectable rugby pedigree. But at the same time, Scott and Eyton regarded the selection as one which, on account of its predominantly Maori composition, would satisfy a much wider section of the paying British public - the curiosity market. The extent to which this balance fluctuated was to play a crucial role in shaping the tour.

---

[52] *The Press*, 16 May 1888, p.5.

CHAPTER TWO

The Honour of the Colony: Colonial Expectations of a Touring Team.

Before proceeding any further in describing structural elements of the Native tour, it is important to clarify a number of distinct and not always harmonious perspectives that were emerging. Loosely defined these are the views of the players, the promoters, the press and the New Zealand provincial rugby union's. Within each of these perspectives, a main component of the following chapters will be to identify continuities and contrasts of attitude. Put simply, in most cases this was a failure of expectations to match subsequent realities. But in journeying to such conclusions, a multitude of issues are revealed with applicability far beyond the superficial interpretation of team selections and on field performances. For above all the Native tour stands as testimony to the very serious emphasis that some sections of society were coming to place on the role of sport - both British and colonial. While subsequent chapters will examine various aspects of this emphasis as expressed in Britain, certain reactions to the progress of the Native team through New Zealand leave no doubt that by 1888 some in the colony had lifted sport from the realms of simple pleasure and

imbued it with considerable powers to shape a wide body of opinion.

As this new emphasis manifested itself in terms of early expectations for the Native tour, there is strong evidence of a pattern very similar to that which had developed in Australia - that is to say a preoccupation with the sort of image of the colony that the team would present to Britain. Principally in Australia during the preceding two decades, much had been made of the role of sport, and especially cricket, as an indicator of the quality of colonial stock. Through the direct and concentrated comparison offered on the sports field, cricket victories over English sides in 1876-77, and more especially those on the Home tours of 1878 and 1882, came to be seen in some quarters
as proof that the convict origins of many Australians and the harsh climate of the continent had not had a deleterious effect. Australians could feel assured that they were fit and able to play a full role in the maintenance of the British Empire.[1]

At the same time in New Zealand, the more recent development of football codes as compared to cricket, made for a far less pronounced exposition of these principles. Nor was there anything as significant as the convict stain to rally against. Yet in 1905, when New Zealand undertook its first fully representative and officially sanctioned rugby tour of Britain, sport clearly emerged as a national focus on a level to rival the Australian pattern. Epitomised by the unhesitating

---

[1] W.F. Mandle, Going it Alone, Ringwood Vic. 1977, pp.24-47.

propaganda of premier, Richard Seddon, the country was quick to embrace a notion that its sporting success had greatly raised awareness in the Mother Country of a superior people conditioned by a unique environment.[2]

Returning to 1888, "Threequarter-Back", football columnist for *The Press*, undoubtedly recognised similar potential for the Native tour.

> The visit of the first football team from New Zealand to the Home Country is an event which is certain to be regarded with great interest by every colonist of both races, and the result of their doings in England is certain to be watched with interest equally as keen as that which attended the matches played by the Australian cricketing team.[3]

At a more straightforward level, *The New Zealand Referee*, while not predicting absolute sporting success for the team, nevertheless exhibited faith in the venture.

> It must certainly be admitted that no fault can be found with the representative nature of the team, almost all parts of New Zealand having a representative to do battle for them, and although they may be beaten in their matches against All England, Scotland and Ireland, still I predict a most prosperous career for the Maori "reps" and feel certain that victory will follow them in the majority of their matches.[4]

However, as we shall soon see, the converse to this pattern operated with a much greater intensity. In the event of indiscretion by the Native team both on and off the field, they could be dismissed in New Zealand as an unrepresentative private speculation beyond the control of rugby officialdom. Yet the team was at the same time a product of the colony and would surely be identified as such by a British public who

---

2 K. Sinclair, A Destiny Apart, Wellington 1986, pp.143-55.

3 *The Press*, 16 May 1888, p.5.

4 *The New Zealand Referee*, 9 March 1888, p.188.

knew no better. Thus it was essential that the Native team should exhibit the highest standard of behaviour in all respects.

It is in a related context to this that the position of the provincial rugby union's can be introduced. For increasingly during the 1880s the emphasis in New Zealand rugby was shifting from a rough and unstructured recreation to a highly developed concern with control and public image. With no prevailing standard as to basic rules, team sizes and playing times during the 1870s, respectable elements had come to see the game as little more than an excuse for anarchy and violence. When a player was killed in a club match in 1877, the coroner claimed that " the game of football was only worthy of savages "[5]. And, in the following year, the *New Zealand Herald* declared that " bull-baiting and cock-fighting have more to commend them as recreations than the rough-and-tumble hoodlum amusement yclept [sic] football which our youths seem to take so much delight in "[6]

To counter this criticism, rugby moved to organise and standardise. Following the model of England's Rugby Football Union, founded in 1871, fourteen provincial unions were established between 1879 and 1889.[7] Referees were given sole jurisdiction on the field, point scoring was made uniform and rules were modified to encourage running and passing skills rather than the brute strength and scrummaging of old.

---

5 Phillips, A Man's Country, p.95.

6 Ibid.

7 Chester & McMillan, Encyclopedia, passim. The unions were, 1879 - Wellington, Canterbury; 1881 - Otago; 1883 - Auckland; 1884 - Hawkes Bay; 1885 - Nelson; 1886 - Wairarapa; Manawatu, Bush; 1887 - Southland; 1888 - South Canterbury; Wanganui; Marlborough; 1889 - Taranaki.

As a final indication of the shift, the 1891 draft constitution of the New Zealand Rugby Football Union devoted seven of its 26 clauses to disciplinary procedures - both on and off the field. At the first meeting of the new Union in 1893, a determination was expressed to

> put down anything which may, in any way, detract from the standing of the game, to secure equal justice to players, while meting out just punishment to offenders, to secure uniformity of rules and practice; to discourage betting and lavish expenditure on the entertainment of teams.[8]

If this process had not run its full course by 1888, one can certainly see signs of it in the responses of the union's to the Native team prior to departure from New Zealand, and the natural corollary of their desire to ensure that the impression of the New Zealand game given overseas was an appropriately complementary one. For the moment, though, the relationship appears to have been fairly smooth. The willingness of the union's to play against the Native team and to assist it with 50 to 60 per cent of gate receipts from these matches[9] suggests that even if the tour was not under their control, collectively or individually, they saw little in its early proceedings to cause alarm. Thus Warbrick was easily able to arrange matches against Hawkes Bay, Auckland, Nelson, Wellington, Canterbury, South Canterbury and Otago - although the late addition of South Canterbury and a return match against Otago suggest that this itinerary was by no means finalised when the tour began.[10]

---

[8] Phillips, A Man's Country, pp.96-7.

[9] Admittedly this figure is somewhat less than the 80 per cent guaranteed to Seddon's British team.

[10] *The Press*, 3 July 1888, p.5; 17 July 1888, p.6.

In a letter of early June the Southland player, Harry Lee, predicted a bright future for the team in writing that " the men appear to be on the whole a quiet sober lot and they all get on well together ".[11] When interviewed about the strength of the combination, Warbrick expressed confidence that they could hold their own against all opposition - being good tacklers and possessing what he considered to be the best backline in the colony. Further, he suggested that opinion in some quarters that the forwards were weak was not justified and could be attributed to the fact that some of the players were not well known outside their own district.[12]

It was therefore with confidence that the Native team approached their first match against Hawkes Bay at Napier on Saturday 23 June 1888. In front of about 1000 spectators, a favourable figure for the locality, they attracted generous if not substantial press comment in winning 5-0. While the victory was not as large as some had expected, and revealed a lack of combination in forward play, a local reporter described the match as

> very hard and fast throughout and in favour of the visiting team both spells. The visitors were much heavier all round than the local players who, with one or two exceptions, were all light men though speedy .... The second spell was as hard a bit of football play as the district has seen for a long time, the play being of determined description and all over the ground, the distinguishing feature of both sides being the passing of the team .... Judging by the play in this match, Warbrick's combination will give provincial clubs some work to do.

---

11 *The Weekly Press*, 8 June 1888, p.697.
12 *The Press*, 16 May 1888, p.5.

One week later the margin of victory over Hawkes Bay was more than doubled (11-0) and then the tourists embarked by steamer for Auckland.[13]

As they began to move through New Zealand, several cracks appeared in what had been a relatively uncontroversial beginning to the tour. The first of these struck directly at the ethos of nineteenth century rugby and triggered precisely those reverberations that proponents of the New Zealand game were striving to avoid. For on 22 June, the day before the opening match at Napier, *The New Zealand Referee* published a report from a private source revealing a major disagreement between players and promoters over terms of payment. The source stated that in addition to first class hotel accommodation throughout the tour, the players were to receive 25 per cent of all takings after expenses. However, some felt that this left too great a share for the promoters and secessions from the team were threatened.[14]

While the dispute, if any existed, must have been resolved in that the team did not undergo any further changes aside from the addition of European players, the implication of such a report was very serious. Although it was acceptable to provide the players with basic travel and living expenses while on tour, any payment for playing the game was strictly prohibited in accordance with the position adopted by the Rugby Football Union in England. For during the 1880s the gentlemanly game

---

[13] *The Press*, 25 June 1888, p.6. See also *The Hawkes Bay Herald*, 25 June 1888, p.2. Unless otherwise stated, all subsequent references to match dates and scores are derived from Swan, History of New Zealand Rugby Football, pp.519-23.

[14] *The New Zealand Referee*, 22 June 1888, p.54.

of amateur rugby, which was to be played for its own ends and not for personal gain or glory, was falling increasingly under threat from its working class component - particularly in Yorkshire and Lancashire. Aside from an established pattern of clubs enticing good players, especially Welshmen, with good jobs and other incentives, some also sought to provide "broken-time" payments to compensate players for lost earnings while playing or through injury. Within seven years of the Native tour these issues were to split British rugby and produce the Northern Union game - modern Rugby League. But in 1886 the Rugby Football Union had shown its determination to preserve the amateur ethos by enacting legislation providing expulsion as the likely penalty for anyone found to have taken material benefit from the game. Two years later strict rules were implemented to control the transfer of players between clubs - thus restricting the practice of enticement.[15] At the same time, the Union, who did not sanction the British tour to New Zealand, banned one of its players, J.P. Clowes, for allegedly accepting payment of £15 for clothing and other tour items from one of Arthur Shrewsbury's business partners. The same meeting also expressed concern that other members of the team had infringed the laws, and all were called upon to provide an affidavit stating that they had received no pecuniary benefit from the tour. This being done, the issue was apparently resolved - although not in the case of Clowes whose suspension remained during the tour.[16]

---

[15] Gate, Rugby League, p.19.

[16] Chester & McMillan, The Visitors, pp.29-30,41.

Thus at the beginning of 1888 the issue of professionalism was very much before the eyes of the New Zealand rugby fraternity. But strangely the provincial union's did not react quickly to accusations against the Native team. In spite of the *Referee* report, the second match against Hawkes Bay on 30 June, and that against Auckland a week later, proceeded without any apparent comment or sanction. The sporting press, on the other hand, were in no doubt as to the action which ought to be taken. "Threequarter-Back", who emerged as a persistent critic of the tour, insisted on measures to avoid embarrassment for the players and, more importantly, to preserve the standing of rugby in the colony.

> The members of the team from Warbrick downwards should declare that they are not receiving and will not receive more than lawful expenses. Further, as the team will go home with the sanction of our local union's, these should require such a declaration before that sanction is given. Wellington, Otago and Canterbury are affiliated to the Rugby Union and being on the spot the committees of these provincial unions should see to it that the team does not go Home under falsecolours. If it does, the players will certainly be disqualified by the Rugby Union and the good name of the unions here will suffer. The duty of requiring the declaration may involve unpleasantness, but it is a duty and in honour should be discharged.[17]

Similarly, the *Referee* columnist, although appearing to dilute his original report, was also insistent that the matter be resolved forthwith. He said that the only purpose in publishing the report was to highlight and clarify the issue of professionalism before the team left New Zealand. In light of the Clowes case, it would be unfortunate and embarrassing if the Native team undertook the long and expensive journey to

---

[17] *The Weekly Press*, 29 June 1888, p.816.

England only to encounter difficulties and possible disqualification.[18]

Warbrick responded quickly in attempting to refute all allegations against the team. On 6 July, presumably in response to an earlier request, he forwarded a reassuring telegram to the Canterbury Rugby Football union. " Absolutely no foundation re charges of professionalism against Native team. All travelling on bare expenses. Circulated reports are made through jealousy ".[19] Two weeks later, when the Native team arrived in Christchurch to play Canterbury, Warbrick announced that a Hawkes Bay solicitor had drawn up a deed of arrangements, signed by all of the team, stating that they were not professionals. As to the term "jealousy" in his telegram, he said that reports of professionalism had been circulated by a Christchurch gentleman who had wanted to take the running of the tour away from Scott and Eyton and join with James Lillywhite and the other promoters of the British tour. Without a doubt Warbrick was referring to the Mr Brown whose overtures he had declined in May.[20]

With this explanation, and more especially the legal provision, the *Referee* declared that matters of professionalism were now satisfactorily resolved. But whether Warbrick's explanation was the complete truth, or instead used to deflect attention, is a moot point. For Brown, if indeed he said anything, was not alone in his views. Aside from the denial of the *Referee* that he was their source, thus

---

18 *The New Zealand Referee*, 6 July 1888, p.79.
19 Ibid.
20 Ibid, 20 July 1888, p.78; *The Press*, 18 July 1888, p.6.

implying that another existed,[21] Arthur Shrewsbury also presented a definite opinion on the matter. In two letters to his English business partners, in May and June 1888, he expressed considerable surprise that the Rugby Football Union had extended its patronage to the tour. " Talk about a speculation ", he wrote on 15 May, " there is one with a vengeance and for the Union at home to give their support, after refusing us, is a clincher - but I imagine they will want to know something more about it before the matches are arranged ".[22] Three weeks later he was more direct in his observations. " These men are professionals hundred to one more than Clowes and all of them I believe have arranged as to the terms to be paid them".[23] That these were private correspondence from one acquainted with rugby touring and organisation, and not designed for public consumption, may add to their credibility. But having expressed regret at not making his own offer to Warbrick, the possibility exists that Shrewsbury may have been coloured by the same jealousy as Brown.

As to the deed of arrangements, it is possible that Warbrick was calling the bluff of his critics in claiming its existence, but at the same time he courted the risk that its tabling may have been demanded by provincial union's before allowing matches to proceed. A similar view must be taken of what was perhaps the most comprehensive denial of professionalism offered by the Native team - a letter from Thomas Eyton to G.

---

21 *The New Zealand Referee*, 20 July 1888, p.78. A similar guarantee was made to the Otago Union. See *The Press*, 19 July 1888, p.5.
22 Shrewsbury to Turner, 15 May 1888.
23 Shrewsbury to Turner, 23 June 1888.

David Gage

Pat Keogh

Roland Hill, Secretary of the Rugby Football Union, written shortly after arriving in England.

> Dear Sir - In accordance with the wishes of your Union, as stated to Mr J.A. Warbrick and myself at a meeting last Friday, I write to say that we are prepared to submit our account for inspection should you desire it at any time for the purpose of making it plain that no member of the team with which we are associated has received or will receive any remuneration for his services beyond his bare travelling expenses.[24]

Again it is extremely doubtful that Warbrick and Eyton would risk calling the bluff of a body renowned for its sensitivity on such matters, and in the long run the Union accepted Eyton's assurances quite readily. Indeed it was noted on several occasions immediately after the arrival of the team that the Union was quite happy with its amateur status and willingly extended patronage.[25] As early as April, the *Daily News* had commented very favourably on the matter. " It is a strictly amateur business, contrasting strongly with the tour which some English players are about to commence in New Zealand and Australia. We hope the New Zealand players will be properly representative of the strength of the colony. If so, the visit is sure to be a great success ".[26] Finally, the Reverend Frank Marshall, a leading rugby historian of the period and a man described by rugby league historian Robert Gate as " an ardent upholder of the amateur ethos and witchfinder-general when it came to rooting out transgressors of the transfer laws ",[27] was quite sure that

---

[24] *The New Zealand Referee*, 23 November 1888, p.9.
[25] See for example, *The Times*, 28 September 1888, p.8; 4 October 1888, p.8; 5 October 1888, p.8.
[26] *Canterbury Times*, 1 June 1888, p.15.
[27] Gate, Rugby League, p.19.

the Native team were not professionals and cited their offer of accounts to support his case.[28]

Even with these comprehensive denials, a number of issues related to professionalism need airing. Firstly, the offer of accounts to the Rugby Football Union did not provide an absolute guarantee against player payments. For although an inspection could confirm that money was not being appropriated to players during the tour, there was no safeguard to prevent any surplus for the promoters being split after the team had left England. Indeed this would be a more likely form of payment in view of the uncertainty of the tours financial position until it had ended. Related to this is the incompatibility, which applied equally to the long British tour, of using unpaid players for a venture from which only the promoters stood to gain. With their basic expenses covered it is unlikely that any of the players stood to lose from the tour, but one can imagine something of a tension arising at the prospect of Scott and Eyton considerably enhancing their own fortunes through the efforts of the players. The position of Warbrick is also a vexed one when viewed in the context of alleged professionalism. On the one hand he was a player supposedly bound by the amateur code, yet at the same time he was an organiser with a close interest in the financial proceedings of the tour.

Irrespective of the view one may ultimately take concerning the question of professionalism, there was an immediate consequence for the Native team. With the tolerance of the

---

[28] F. Marshall, Football: The Rugby Union Game, London 1894, p.504.

Rugby Football Union only becoming fully apparent once the team had reached England, the New Zealand public, press and rugby union's were now inclined to view the preliminary stages of the tour with a good deal of suspicion. This situation was not enhanced when a second controversy erupted concerning the addition of European players.

As already noted, the inclusion of one European player, George Williams, preceded the opening of the tour. Strangely, though, in view of what was to follow, this move produced little initial reaction other than a rather cynical quip in the *Canterbury Times*. " How he hopes to pass muster we cannot say, unless it is by a liberal dose of walnut juice. Perhaps he will remain a pakeha, and go to England as a representative of the athletic colonial youth ".[29]

By mid July critics were less inclined to be flippant. Whatever the catalyst for adding Elliot, Madigan and McCausland to the touring party, the move served only to provoke hostility. What emerges from the press at this time is a clear statement that Warbrick's addition of European players posed a direct threat to the authority of the provincial rugby union's. As a consequence ones perception of the whole tour is placed in an intriguing relief whereby it is implied that the use of only Maori players did not pose such a threat. The *Otago Witness* of 20 July presented the case in these terms.

> If these men are to be allowed to play, there is nothing to hinder Warbrick from picking up good men from each of the provinces and making the team a New Zealand one. If a New Zealand team is to go home, well and good, but by all means let it be a thoroughly representative one and in that case it

---

[29] *Canterbury Times*, 22 June 1888, p.14. As to being a representative of athletic colonial youth, Williams, at 32, was the oldest player in the team.

> should be a team sent home by the New Zealand unions and not a money-making venture promoted by messrs Warbrick & co.[30]

At the same time at least two union's were seen to shift dramatically from their earlier tolerance. On 19 July *The Press* reported that there was considerable doubt as to whether the Otago Rugby Union would consent to play any Native team with a European component,[31] and the Hawkes Bay Union passed a motion condemning the inclusions. " That this Union considers the addition of Europeans to Mr Warbrick's Native team injurious and encroaching upon the functions of the various rugby unions in New Zealand ". A further motion was also foreshadowed. " That in the even of Mr Warbrick taking Europeans to England to play in his Native team, the Union withdraw its patronage ".[32] This motion proceeded no further, although the Union did send a letter to Warbrick asking him to inform those in Britain that the team was not generally representative of the colony and that the European players had only been added in an emergency due to a shortage of suitable Maori talent.[33] Otago, after a strong warning to Warbrick that the inclusion of Europeans was in contravention of an earlier agreement, also agreed to proceed with arrangements for its matches.[34]

The revelation of an agreement between Warbrick and the unions that the team would consist only of Maori players is suggestive that they were viewed in a category somewhat

---

30 *Otago Witness*, 20 July 1888, p.26.
31 *The Press*, 19 July 1888, p.5.
32 *The Weekly Press*, 27 July 1888, p.976.
33 *The New Zealand Referee*, 10 August 1888, p.140.
34 *The Weekly Press*, 27 July 1888, p.976.

different to Europeans. Indeed the Hawkes Bay view that European inclusions would encroach on the authority of the union's implies the converse that a purely Maori team would not encroach. Certainly the desire of the union's to keep a tight control over their European players is entirely consistent with other developments during this period. But why this does not extend to Maori players is difficult to explain. Indeed the most general attitude of European to Maori during the late nineteenth century inclines to the suggestion of a more stringent stance against those commonly regarded as possessing a less stable moral character and control. Furthermore, with seven current provincial players in the party, and most others having appeared for European clubs, the Maori members of the Native team were hardly distant from the established rugby fold and its jurisdiction. For want of further evidence, the position of the provincial union's can only be described as ambiguous.

Whether this apparent loophole had any part in encouraging Eyton to pursue a Maori team is unclear. In an interview with the *Referee*, published in late July, both he and Scott explained that it had originally been intended to take a team consisting only of Maori players. However, " with a due regard for the decent dignity of the rugby game ", they had found this impossible. This at least confirms earlier points concerning Warbrick's rather limited selection options and the tenuous justification for selecting a Maori team in the first place. Anything more is pure speculation. The promoters, nevertheless, claimed that as all members of the team were native born the proposition was still an attractive one and

worthy of support, and recognition of the team by the New Zealand union's was implicit in their agreeing to play matches against it.[35]

While the press certainly shared the union concern with control, some also saw the issue as one of viability and the idea that a team containing Europeans would not be an attraction in Britain. The *Referee* put it thus:

> As there are only four or five, we believe, in the team who can claim to be fair types of the Maori race, we fancy our English friends will be disappointed, and the playing of the team may lack attraction in consequence. We are afraid it will certainly not be the draw it otherwise would. But now that Mr Warbrick has seen fit to take a mixed team away we would suggest ... that he and the other promoters ask the cooperation of the New Zealand unions in making the team a thoroughly representative one of the colony by taking in some of its best players who could no doubt be secured. This would prove a much greater success, we feel assured, at home than the present half and half team.[36]

The *Taieri Advocate* offered a very similar appraisal of the team as now constituted.

> Lovers of the sport at home will not take nearly the same interest in the doings of the visitors as were the team composed wholly of Maoris and half-castes; consequently the attendance of onlookers will certainly not be so great. The advent of a native team would be sure to draw well in any of the large centres of population - whether able to conquer or obliged to accept the position of the vanquished. But when one knows that the title of the visitors was a misnomer, the reverse would assuredly apply.[37]

Yet it is unlikely that these responses were a simple concern with the financial outcome of the tour. Rather they may reveal further distinction between European and Maori as regards the impression to be conveyed in Britain. For once a few European players had been added, the call quickly came to transform the

---

35 *The New Zealand Referee*, 20 July 1888, p.98.

36 Ibid.

37 *Otago Witness*, 3 August 1888, p.26.

tour into a fully representative one that would provide the best account of European interests. Without these players the press appeared content with team composition, and one is reminded of the *Referee*'s earlier praise for its representative character. A "mixed" team, should it not succeed, ran the risk of casting its European members in other than an ideal light. A Maori team offered no such internal comparisons.

Amid these controversies the fortunes of the Native team on the field were also rather variable. A five tries to nil defeat at the hands of Auckland on 7 July constituted a major setback for the tourists and led one local reporter to offer a scathing assessment of their potential.

> Taken collectively the Maoris are a poor team .... They lack combination, are very poor at packing the scrums, and the majority of the backs are indifferent at picking up .... I think that if such a team goes to England a false impression will be conveyed of the rugby game as played in New Zealand. It is pretty certain that as at present constituted, there are several senior clubs in the colony who could defeat them.[38]

Of comparable dimensions, in terms of tour prospects, was the loss of Joe Warbrick. Easily the best player in the original team, he suffered broken bones in his foot as the result of a tackle, did not play again until December, and did not regain his best form at any time during the tour.[39]

But reinforced by Auckland players, the Native team proceeded to an easy, if unspectacular, 9-0 victory over Nelson on 11 July and a 3-0 success against Wellington three days later. In a further twist to the European controversy, it was reported that Jack Taiaroa had agreed to play against

---

38 *The Press*, 9 July 1888, p.5.
39 Ibid.

Wellington on condition that the Native team was purely Maori. However, with Elliot and Madigan in the side he did not play.[40]

Next the team travelled down to Christchurch and, in front of a large crowd including many Maori from Kaiapoi and surrounding districts, narrowly defeated Canterbury 5-4. Again, though, the tourists encountered criticism - this time for its attitude to match officials.

> So far as the spirit in which the match was played is concerned, there was a certain amount of fault to find. The Natives had a pronounced tendency to questions the umpire's decisions, and although in the majority of cases both flags were raised in answer to appeals, the murmuring was none the less indulged in. F. Warbrick was especially conspicious in the respect and certainly needs to curb himself. As both the umpires are very able and fair gentlemen, as able and fair as any in New Zealand, the murmuring was altogether inexcusable. The fact that they were almost invariably agreed, giving the referee no more to do than blow his whistle at once, speaks volumes in favour of the opinion expressed above that the Natives need to play more according to the rules. It must not be supposed, however, that there was any unseemly wrangling in the field. The murmuring was of a comparatively subdued kind and chiefly annoying to officials and players. But together with the talking often indulged in, it should be suppressed if the Natives would really make certain of pleasing games where they go.[41]

Four days later, after further criticisms, "Threequarter-Back" offered a now familiar explanation for his views.

> I dwell at this length on the bad points because the team will to an extent carry the honour of the colony in their hands at home, and even if their play does not improve, their spirit must do if they are to avoid rough games with some teams that doubtless they will meet, and do credit to followers of the game here.[42]

After completing an easy 9-0 victory over South Canterbury, the team travelled to Dunedin and lost a close match 10-8 to Otago on 28 July. Again they attracted criticism for their

---

[40] *The New Zealand Referee*, 20 July 1888, p.103; See also *The Press*, 14 July 1888, p.6. There is no other information concerning these arrangements, although the Wellington match was used as a belated attempt to persuade Taiaroa to change his mind and join the tour.

[41] *The Press*, 23 July 1888, p.6.

[42] *Weekly Press*, 27 July 1888, p.75.

playing methods. As *The Press* reported; " The game was an exceedingly rough one. The Native team seemed determined to win by fair means or foul. Downes and Croxford both were kicked on the head rather badly, the former having rather a bad cut ".[43] Finally, after an uninspiring 1-0 victory in the return match against Otago, the bulk of the Native team embarked by steamer for Melbourne on 1 August 1888 - Warbrick, Eyton and Nehua having proceeded there a week earlier.[44]

With the first leg of the tour completed, the impression created by the team was mixed. On the field they had won seven matches and lost only to Auckland and Otago - the leading provincial sides of the 1888 season. Against this, however, lay an undercurrent of suspicion from the press that they were not ideally suited to convey an appropriate image of the colony to the Mother Country. The motives for the tour were suspect, it was tainted with the possibility of professionalism and its sporting conduct was far from perfect. At the same time, though, the seeming ambivalence of the provincial rugby union's leads one to wonder whether these views were a little sensational and over-sensitive. The union's, though threatening to take action against the team, did not ultimately withdraw their patronage or make any negative representations to the Rugby Football Union in England.

A final test of feeling towards the tour can, in part, be deduced from a comparison with reactions to the 1884 and 1893 New Zealand tours to Australia - the first tour overseas

---

[43] *The Press*, 1 August 1888, p.5.
[44] Eyton, Rugby Football, p.6.

and the first tour under the auspices of the New Zealand Rugby Football Union. In both cases an examination of the period immediately preceding the departure of the tour, using the same newspaper sources as for the Native team, reveals little comparable evidence of criticism or controversy. In 1884 there was a low level of debate concerning the merits of some of those selected, but as the cooperation of the rugby union's was forthcoming and a fully representative team had been selected, there was no question that this privately organised tour should proceed and the team was loudly cheered upon its departure from Wellington.[45] The 1893 tour was dogged in part by the refusal of Canterbury and Otago to affiliate to the newly formed New Zealand union, and players from these provinces did not tour. But over the country as a whole there seems again to have been no comparable opposition to the tour or to those finally selected. As one North Island correspondent described it; " The team is one of which New Zealand need not be ashamed and which will, I feel confident, give a very good account of itself over the other side ".[46] Interestingly, this observation was as close as any press source came to place either tour in the context of broader colonial aspirations prior to its departure. Only upon its return was the 1893 team accorded greater recognition with a Prime Ministerial reception and the leader of the opposition, William Rolleston, describing its efforts as " a great national congratulation ".[47]

---

[45] *Canterbury Times*, 4 May 1884, p.13; 10 May 1884, p.13; 7 June 1884, p.12.
[46] *The New Zealand Referee*, 30 March 1893, p.27; 20 May 1893, p.26; 1 June 1893, p.27; 15 June 1893, p.27.
[47] Sinclair, A Destiny Apart, p.145.

That the Native team attracted a much greater volume and intensity of criticism prior to departure can not ultimately be attributed to its predominantly Maori composition. Indeed it can be seen that an exclusively Maori team caused far less animosity than one with a European component. Rather, it may be that the destination of the team was an important factor. While Australia was larger, longer established and very much a focus of interest for New Zealand during the late nineteenth century, it was nevertheless colonial in character. Britain, by contrast, was the heart of Empire, the centre of political and administrative authority and the origin of a large portion of the New Zealand population. Images portrayed to Britain, and success against her sportsmen, carried far more kudos than those against neighbouring colonies. Conversely, those who did not present an ideal picture were of potentially greater damage to the standing of the colony.

CHAPTER THREE

Maori Enough: British Responses to Imperialism and Race.

After a six week journey from Melbourne, the Native team which arrived at Tilbury Docks, London, on 27 September 1888 was generally in sound condition although lacking a little basic fitness. Their arrival, according to *The Sportsman*, " caused much curiosity and the natives who carried with them some relics of their race in the shape of spears & c. were surrounded by crowds of spectators ".[1] Having been welcomed by messrs F.W. Burnard of the Rugby Football Union and Olivey of Surrey, the team moved to the Greyhound Hotel, Richmond, to prepare for the opening match of the tour against Surrey on 3 October - the same day as the British team made their last appearance in New Zealand.[2]

But the period immediately following the arrival of the team in Britain holds a much wider significance than its playing arrangements. For at this point of first contact, certain elements of the British press revealed an awareness of two of the most potentially important themes in a study of this nature. Firstly, there is the link between sport and imperial ideals as encapsulated by a colonial touring team, and secondly, the position of the Native team within patterns of

---

1 *The Sportsman*, 28 September 1888, p.4.
2 Eyton, Rugby Football, p.6; McCarthy, Maori Rugby Story, p.66.

Victorian response to non-white people on their own soil, as distinct from the detached perspective gleaned from those with experience on the "frontiers" of Empire. Yet in observing these themes, care needs to be taken in gauging both their significance and their extent. For in echoing a pattern revealed by John Mulvaney and Rex Harcourt in writing of the 1868 Aboriginal cricket tour, it appears that the significance of issues of imperialism and race in 1888-89 lies as much in a matter of omissions as coherence.[3]

While the previous chapter has demonstrated an appreciation in New Zealand of the influence of sport in conveying an image of the colony to Britain, it can equally be seen that this was a reciprocal process. In response to questions as to how the British Empire was able to maintain such a widespread and lengthly domination without undue incident and with a relatively minor military presence, scholars such as Brian Stoddart, Richard Holt and W.F. Mandle have emphasised the role of cultural forces - common ideals, beliefs and conventions which bound the governing circles of Empire through informal authority systems. Most obvious here was a common language and literary tradition readily accepted by a similar class of people over a wide area. But the role of sport in such a process is also coming increasingly to be appreciated. In its most general terms, the model is of a public school elite, whether missionary or military in character, transferring to the far flung corners of Empire not only the structures of its games but also the wider notions of sport as

---

[3] Mulvaney & Harcourt, Cricket Walkabout, pp.130-40.

a training for life embodying the essentials of discipline conformity and cooperation. Especially when combined with efforts to replicate the public school educational model through the placement of English masters in leading colonial schools, sport was ideally fostered along egalitarian, apolitical lines which sought to transcend sectional divisions and create a common bond for its participants - a bond which would eventually extend beyond the field of play.[4]

When an international dimension was added to sport, especially with the cementing of Anglo-Australian cricket links from the 1860s, the elite ideal remained the same. Irrespective of the fact that a series of Australian victories beginning in the 1870s had inspired in those colonies an increasing sense of national self confidence and independence from Britain, Lord Harris, the doyen of English cricket administrators, was still able to hold to the view that " the game of cricket had done more to draw the Mother Country and the colonies together than years of beneficial legislation could have done ".[5] As noted earlier, a similar response was to emerge during the 1905 All Black tour.

A natural corollary to this use of sport as a binding for those of European extraction was of course its extension to the indigenous peoples of Empire - and especially their traditional elites - as a means of bridging cultural differences and assisting assimilation as a means of control. Although such

---

[4] See B. Stoddart, " Sport, cultural imperialism and colonial response in the British Empire ", Comparative Studies in Society and History, Vol.30, No.4, October 1988, pp.649-73; R. Holt, Sport and the British, Oxford 1989, pp.203-36; Mandle, Going it Alone, pp.24-47.

[5] Inglis, " Imperial Cricket ", p.155.

ideas were seldom expressed so openly, and indeed Holt suggests that an informal imposition of British culture more easily weakened opposition to it,[6] the evidence is widespread. In India especially, the Princes were incorporated into the Raj through bonds enhanced by cricket, billiards, polo, hockey and, to a lesser extent, forms of football. Furthermore, establishments such as Mayo and Rajkumar college's reinforced this with the adoption of very much of an English public school corriculum.[7] Similarly, in the West Indies, although complex racial hierarchies and elements of discrimination remained until the 1960s, such schools as Harrison College in Barbadoes and Queens Royal College in Trinidad encouraged the cricket of their black students as a clear means of fostering loyalty to England and English ideals.[8] The case for Australia is one subsumed in a myriad of different, generally more aggressive or paternalistic, attitudes to Aborigines and in some instances an open policy of extermination. But even within these limitations there is ample evidence of at least a missionary inclination to sustain their cricket as a means of assimilation and control.[9]

As to New Zealand, the dynamics of Maori adoption of European sport have still to be adequately researched. Yet the evidence of the opening chapter, especially for Te Aute College under J.C. Thornton, suggests at least traces of a similar ideology at work. Furthermore, the concern which emerged in the press as to the implications of the Native team's conduct

---

6 Holt, Sport and the British, pp.212-13.
2 Ibid, pp.211-17,219-23.
3 Ibid, pp.219-21; Stoddart, " cultural imperialism ", pp.661-4.
9 Mulvaney & Harcourt, Cricket Walkabout, passim

is enough to suggest that some saw the Maori contribution to sport as having a significant influence one way or the other.

Thus the only remarkable feature of the sentiment expressed by *The Times* on the morning following the opening match against Surrey is the absolute clarity with which it captures the developing ideal. The tour was clearly important for reasons far beyond sport.

> From one point of view it is a tribute to our colonising faculty. The colonising race that can imbue the aboriginal inhabitants of the colonised countries with a love for its national games, would seem to have solved the problem of social amalgamation in those countries. That we are not uniformly successful in introducing cricket and football to our colonies and dependencies is not for want of an active propaganda. Wherever the Englishman goes he carries the bat and the goal posts. Not to speak of countries in which he has settled permanently, the first leisure day in an invaded colony is sure to bring forth its cricket match or its athletic sports, in the later of which, at all events, the natives with that touch of nature which makes the world akin, take a fraternal interest.[10]

Not only did the Maori people possess the necessary physical attributes, but also the training and chivalry to gain maximum value from football. The Native team merely extended a list which included Australian cricket teams, a touring Canadian soccer team and growing sporting participation in South Africa. In short, " The popularity of our English games in the colonies is a striking phenomenon. It forms a bond of sympathy between the various parts of the Empire of which, perhaps, the strength is as yet imperfectly realised ".[11]

A week earlier, *The Daily Telegraph* had speculated in similar fashion after the team arrived in London.

---

[10] *The Times*, 4 October 1888, p.9.
[11] Ibid.

> The spectacle of the noble Maori coming from different parts of the earth to play an English game against English players is essentially a phenomenon of our times; and it is a phenomenon that is of the very essence of peace and bears a message of kindly import and good-will towards men. It is one of our proud boasts that wherever we go, whatever lands we conquer, we found the great national instinct of playing games. Plant a dozen Englishmen anywhere - on an island, in a backwoods clearing or in the Indian hills - and in a wonderfully short time the old schoolboy instinct will out, and the level sward is turned into a cricket-field in summer and a football arena in winter[12]

The significance of these sentiments, and especially the former, lies not only in their appearance in two of the most influential and widely read newspapers of the period, but also in their placement as leading rather than sporting articles. They are enough to suggest that long before the eulogising traditionally associated with the 1905 All Black team, at least some elements of the British elite regarded New Zealand sport as having a legitimate role to match that ascribed to Australia since the 1870s. Thus some justification also emerges for the views adopted by "Threequarter-Back" and company prior to the departure of the team. For as much as sport had the power to bind Mother Country and colony, by implication any indiscretion would be interpreted not merely as a failure of sportsmen or sporting administrators but as an indicator of wider colonial weaknesses.

Yet the difficulty in drawing strong conclusions on this theme is that the extracts cited above are the only two of their kind to appear in relation to the Native tour. One is thus presented with reservations about their relevance and representative character. Does the omission from other sources, and particularly those outside London, indicate that

---

12 *The Daily Telegraph*, 28 September 1888, p.8.

such views represent a minority attitude or interest on questions of sporting imperialism? There is nothing in available scholarship to suggest regional or class variations on the imperial model within Britain. In fact it seems that the most one can point to is a substantial passivity or ignorance of such issues beyond the elite. That large sections of the population ignored it can be termed neither an endorsement nor a rejection.

But there may also be a simple question of relevance which is reflected in press coverage of the tour. For there is an obvious contrast between the size and cosmopolitanism of London and the standard example of a close-knit northern mill or mining community. it is certain that rather abstract interpretations of imperial bonding, and indeed the exigency of nineteenth century imperial policy as a whole, figured very low in the north against practical concerns of survival, work and community affairs. This is especially true for people whose incomes tended to prohibit travel far beyond their immediate locality and thus left them with an "inner directed" world view. Moreover, such elements as these were unlikely to have impinged on Lord Harris and company. Consequently, the press in centres of smaller population, which also frequently carried the restrictions of content imposed by weekly rather than daily publication, tended only to focus on the Native team at times of direct relevance such as a match or matches in their locality. In this context it is revealing that many of the community based newspapers do not even provide the result of the international match against England on 16 February 1889, and the vast majority of

information concerning aspects of the tour beyond the field of play is gleaned from the wider focus of the London press.

It is obvious therefore that any link between colonial sports tours and ideals of imperialism requires a qualification. One must remember that the views expressed are essentially those of an interested elite, and although this body had a monopoly on both influence and vehicles of communication, the impact at ground level is a moot point. It follows, then, that the view from the colonies was somewhat exaggerated. For "Threequarter-Back" and others to suggest in general terms that "those at home" derived a wider meaning from the visit of the Native or any other colonial team is, strictly speaking, a misrepresentation of the case.

To some extent a similar set of constraints must necessarily herald any discussion of race issues during the Native tour. For again, the sparse comment which does emerge in the press, consisting of perhaps a dozen substantive references, is almost exclusively confined to London sources. At the same time, there is nothing in the work of British historians to suggest any regional variations in Victorian racial attitudes. The spectacle of dark skinned sportsmen in one's locality, and the curiosity this is certain to have aroused among people with little or no experience of non-white people, surely induced a reaction far beyond the abstract of imperialism. Yet there is at present no means of quantifying this or assessing it for continuities or differences.[13]

---

[13] See C. Bolt, Victorian Attitudes to Race, London 1971; P. Rich, Race and Empire in British Politics, New York 1986.

For the evidence which does present itself, a problem of method arises in that one can not simply test the experiences of the Native tour against a standard agenda of racial attitudes. It is abundantly clear from even a cursory glance at Bolt and Rich, and bearing in mind the substantial ground that remains unexplored in this field, that a common pattern is not to be found. Rich presents the range of opinion in these terms.

> Victorian racialism represented a complex amalgam of competing ideologies and interests and developed a set of stereotypes towards blacks that portrayed them as both savage and bestial figures who needed to be controlled at all costs, and as savage and helpless beings in need of care and protection.[14]

Within these extremes were incorporated views determined by a shifting racial consciousness in Europe, the demand or otherwise for cheap colonial labour and strands relating to the old anti-slavery lobby. In addition, from the late 1850s, one must digest a diverse body of anthropological or "scientific" racism derived, in part, from Darwinian theories.[15] Further, there is the matter of differing responses to Maori, Aborigine, Indian or African depending upon place, time and circumstance, and the vexatious half-caste pathology which revealed numerous and conflicting opinions concerning those of mixed parentage.[16]

Even allowing for the somewhat exhaustive task of isolating and clarifying these various components and the periods in which they held currency, one is again presented with questions of representation and popular acceptance. For as

---

[14] Rich, Race and Empire, p.12.
[15] Ibid, pp.12-13.
[16] Ibid, pp.120-145.

Christine Bolt reminds us, although an expanding popular press and literacy during the late nineteenth century opened channels of communication to the articulate in all walks of life, those who were most vocal on issues of race remained middle and not working class and presented a view as they thought others saw it.[17] In related vein, Rich argues for the existence of a sustained cultural provincialism on race issues in Victorian Britain, due in part to a weakness of popular thought regarding nationalism. With the English Channel acting as a crucial physical, ideological and intellectual barrier, Britain largely escaped the great age of nineteenth century European nation building and the heightened racial consciousness which accompanied it. Thus debate on race and inter-racial contact tended to confine itself to an imperial context and to specialists with an eye to influencing policy rather than public opinion.[18] Thus any attempt to cast even the limited race discussion of the Native tour in a broader context is prone to distort a set of experiences which revolved for a large part around contacts with working class people and their communities. Conversely, it will also be demonstrated, in due course, that something of the limited response to race issues was due to a clear perception of the Native team as being somewhat less than truly "native".

For the moment, though, what follows is necessarily a brief discussion of incidents within the tour. It does, however, sustain one valuable comparison - that with the 1868 Aboriginal cricket team. For aside from an as yet unresearched

---

17 Bolt, Victorian Attitudes, pp.xii-xiii.
18 Rich, Race and Empire, pp.5-6.

Unaccustomed to Maori Visitors, there was ample opportunity to play on British imagination - The Illustrated London News, 13 October 1888.

Parsee cricket tour of 1888, the Aboriginal party offers the only other instance of a non-white sporting venture during the nineteenth century.[19] It thus shares with the Native team the important aspect that unlike other "native" visitors to Britain, whose visits were of cultural, academic or related interest, the touring teams were the only groups to test their qualities against British stock under the direct and quantifiable conditions imposed by an enclosed sporting arena. The similarities which emerge between the two tours are enough to suggest some general trends in British attitudes during this period.

One feature that had an important bearing on the early stages of both tours was a simple lack of contact with non-white people. Although there had certainly been blacks in London during the eighteenth century, their numbers declined almost completely with the abolition of slavery in 1807 and were not revived until the appearance of identifiable communities of seamen, students, traders and the like after the 1880s. Thus deprived, Victorians were inclined to accept generally inaccurate and sensationalist reporting which in turn imbued them with distorted expectations and reactions.[20] Indeed the issue was as much one of race as a general ignorance of distant lands. In 1878 at least one observer expressed considerable surprise that the touring Australian cricket team were not black like their Aboriginal predecessors.[21] There was also a tendency in this environment

---

19 The 1900 West Indies cricket tour of England contained only a small number of black players, and specific comment on them is limited.

20 Bolt, Victorian Attitudes, pp.6-7; Rich, Race and Empire, pp.120-1.

21 Inglis, " imperial cricket ", p.149.

for speculators and others to play on popular ignorance with "circus" presentations of various non-white visitors - a situation which certainly applied in respect of some of the earliest Maori in Britain.

The first known Maori visitor, Moehanga of the Ngapuhi, was granted an audience with King George III in 1807 and attracted considerable attention wherever he appeared in public. Better documented is the visit of Hongi Hika in 1820. After a Royal audience, visits to the House of Lords, Woolwich Arsenal and the Tower of London among other sites, Hongi resided for several months in Cambridge assisting with the compilation of a Maori dictionary. Throughout his stay he was lionised by London society and showered with gifts - most of which he eventually traded for muskets in Sydney. In 1829-30, Whiti and Ariki Toa of Ngati Maru were toured through England and Wales as a commercial speculation with posters claiming that both had partaken of human flesh. As the century progressed, interest remained. Tamihana, a son of the famed Te Rauparaha, was a notable visitor during the 1850s and the group of "chiefs" toured by William Jenkins created a significant impression during the following decade. In sum, though, these encounters were neither regular or particularly accurate in their portrayal.[22]

Thus for both the Aboriginal and Native tours there can be found a pronounced fascination with the physical characteristics of the players - as if to suggest that even their basic form was a matter of uncertainty. In 1868,

---

22 B. Mackrell, Hariru Wikitoria, Auckland 1985, pp.9-13,105; " A long history of Welsh-Maori competition ", *The Dominion*, 1 October 1982.

contrary to much expectation, the Aborigines were portrayed as strong and manly. Yet *The Field* also found elements of the unusual in their appearance. " They are veritable Australian natives with the straight hair and peculiar physical organisation of the Australian Aborigines ". And later, " Their hair and beards are long and wiry and most of them have broadly expanded nostrils, but they are all of the true Australian type ".[23] Two decades later, the same publication provided an enthusiastic summary of the Native team after the Surrey match " It was evident to the nearest tyro that our visitors lacked little in point of physique, their appearance betokening both strength and staying power, two things quite essential to the successful playing of football ".[24] Referring to the same match, *The Illustrated London News* described the team as " all men of fine growth, well knit and well proportioned ",[25] while *The Daily Telegraph* saw them as " finely built men with characteristic olive complexions, bright brown eyes, singularly white teeth and it may be said that they have agreeable voices and pleasant manners ".[26] After the tour, George Williams recalled similar impressions from the British press. " It was humourously stated in English newspapers that the Maori players had abnormally well developed legs and especially feet, and that therefore the

---

23 *The Field*, 21 March 1868, p.233; 30 May 1868, p.428; Mulvaney & Harcourt, Cricket Walkabout, pp.105f.

24 *The Field*, 6 October 1888, p.505.

25 *Illustrated London News*, 13 October 1888, p.418.

26 *The Daily Telegraph*, 4 October 1888, p.8.

centre of gravity being low down they took a good hold of the ground and were hard to upset ".[27]

By slight contrast, *The Times* suggested that aside from their dusky complexion the Native team were not significantly different from an English XV in their appearance on the field.

> But the strain on the whole is Maori enough to have offered a sharp contrast of complexion and build to their opponents yesterday - a contrast which was by no means all in favour of the Englishmen. Handsome physogomy and blameless physique, this later, however, more commonly seen here in gymnasts than in field athletes, at once won the Maoris golden opinions from the large crowd which had assembled to see their performance.

In closing, the writer expressed disappointment that the team did not live up to the myth of playing without boots.[28]

When the team reached Hawick for their only Scottish match in late November, the local press exhibited a mixture of surprise and admiration.

> They were as fine a body of stalwart, muscular, athletic men as anyone might wish to meet. Among their number are four [sic] British colonists, but the Maoris themselves could be easily identified by their dusky olive-brown complexion. They are not unlike Europeans, that is the resemblance is great when one remembers that they were a savage tribe no further back than a generation, perhaps. Their heads are well formed. Several of them possess black moustaches - sufficient indication that they have departed from the custom once common among the Maori of removing all vestiges of hair from the face. Their shapely heads are crowned with a crop of thick black hair.[29]

In sum, the appearance of the visitors, though regarded as impressive, offered nothing especially surprising to the unacquainted observer. In fact the *Dewsbury Reporter*, perhaps

---

27 Williams. in Eyton, Rugby Football, p.91.

28 *The Times*, 4 October 1888, p.8. See also, *The Runcorn Guardian*, 6 March 1889, p.8.

29 *Hawick Press*, 22 November 1888. From " The Pathfinders " Scotland v New Zealand Test Programme, Dunedin 1990.

with an eye to the physical qualities of manual workers in its own locality, offered a total contradiction to the prevailing sentiment. " Taken as a whole their physique is by no means as impressive as one would suppose from the expressions of the press, indeed some of them are absolutely small and by no means superior to the average local player ".[30]

Beyond the matter of mere appearance, perceptions of and reactions to the behaviour of the Native team are more revealing. In its lengthly leading article of 28 September, *The Daily Telegraph* displayed both ignorance and a strain of the "noble savage" mentality when introducing the tour to its readers.

> We have been invaded, and the Maori is upon us. Full five-and-twenty strong he landed at Plymouth, moved to Fenchurch St and is now encamped at Richmond, busily preparing and practising for the forthcoming fifty or sixty pitched battles to be fought in the course of the coming season. Yet the timid may take heart of grace; this invasion of peaceful and pleasant character threatens no new danger to England, nor is there any immediate prospect of Mr Joe Warbrick, the head and chief of the tribesmen, fulfilling the historians prophesy and being found meditating upon the ruins of what was once St Paul's Cathedral. It is but another of those ever-welcome colonial invasions in which our fellow subjects from across the sea come to wage friendly war with us in some of our national sports and pasttimes .... The Maoris have certainly progressed since Captain James Cook, in the little Endeavour, landed at Poverty Bay in the year 1769 and found the finely painted and neatly tattooed ancestors of our visitors eating each other in the bush.[31]

The reference to "tribesmen" and especially the closing remarks concerning cannibalism are entirely consistent with the billing giving Whiti and Ariki Toa in 1829-30 and with a general tone of sensationalism based on ignorance.

---

30 *Dewsbury Reporter*, 3 November 1888, p.2.
31 *The Daily Telegraph*, 28 September 1888, p.8.

Attitudes to the performance of the Haka at the beginning of the tour, and to the use of Maori language on the field, reveal more than anything else a degree of patronising curiosity. Scott stated prior to departure from New Zealand that the team would perform a Haka before each match, and that they were taking with them elaborate "mats" and traditional costume to embellish such performance. " The display ", he said " will no doubt be at once novel and attractive ".[32] However, as Eyton records, the response to the Haka against Surrey was hardly enthusiastic. " The native team appeared in their mats and gave their war cry - Ake Ake Kia Kaha - which little pantomime was somewhat ridiculed by the English press and the mats were afterward discarded ".[33] Similarly, *The Sporting Life* of 4 October described the team as " giving three cheers for their first English adversaries and then a "whoop" in the vernacular which caused great amusement ".[34] And Frank Marshall, reflecting on the tour in 1894, dismissed the significance of the Haka as nothing more than a gimmick.

> In the early matches of the tour the New Zealanders appeared on the field in their native mats and headdresses and uttered their well-known cry of Ake, Ake, Kia, Kaha, ... and undoubtedly curiosity had much to do with the attendance at the games. Later, when the real merit of their play was recognised, they discarded these advertising spectacles and depended upon their genuine exhibition of football to attract spectators.[35]

---

[32] *The New Zealand Referee*, 20 July 1888, p.103. Once recent writer has claimed that the team had an agreement with the British press to perform the Haka before each match. This is not, however, substantiated by other sources or by the British reaction. See "The Pathfinders".

[33] Eyton, Rugby Football, p.17.

[34] *The Sporting Life*, 4 October 1888, p.4.

[35] Marshall, The Rugby Union Game, p.505.

In equally cynical vein, the London correspondent to the Sydney *Bulletin* had no doubt as to the place of the Haka and other Maori elements in the tour.

> The Maori football team in England appear to combine the attributes of a football team and a circus. When they go on the ground they have their mats and rugs on and they dance a war-dance and sing a war-song before beginning play. This intimidates the other side and attracts huge piles of gate money. The Maori umpire, instead of the normal walking stick that umpires use, carries a war club. The British spectators sit by in a flutter of excitement, expecting him to dash out the brains of some of the players on the slightest sign of a dispute. Of course the show draws like a mustard-plaster and the promoters ought to make heaps of money.[36]

A similar response accompanied the language of the team. it was reported following the match against Barrow and District that the use of Maori had caused much amusement among local supporters,[37] while throughout the tour the team derived their own pleasure from overhearing personal remarks about them made in ignorance of the fact that they spoke English.[38]

Such comments, and the response to the Haka, are, however, more in the nature of an insensitivity based on ignorance than any deliberate racist expression. Indeed, on available evidence, Mulvaney and Harcourt's summary of 1868 seems equally applicable to the Native team. " The anthropologist in search of racial tensions is more impressed by their rarity than with their serious nature " - the only incident of the Aboriginal tour occurring when the team was excluded from a luncheon tent at York.[39] Moreover, contrary to original expectations, they attracted little interest in the realms of "scientific

---

36 *Lyttelton Times*, 22 November 1888, p.3.
37 *Barrow News*, 9 March 1889, p.7.
38 *The Press*, 24 May 1889, p.5.
39 Mulvaney & Harcourt, Cricket Walkabout, pp.137,139.

racism", leaving Mulvaney and Harcourt to conclude that " It would prove simple to name an XI consisting of Darwinian evolutionary theorists who should have found the Aborigines worth watching ".[40] In similar fashion, only a single example of what might be termed a deliberate racial slur emerges in connection with the Native team. In an interview with local players following the match at Rochdale on 18 March, " all [of the team] most positively asserted that they would not play against the "darkies" for no one, for they say they are only half civilised ".[41] Even then this may be a reference to rough play. But it was not echoed in any other quarter, and those who had been derogatory towards the Haka readily joined the majority in heartily praising the athleticism and playing skill of the visitors. Further, as subsequent chapters will show, in spite of a variety of problems and controversies during the course of the tour, the team had only fond recollections of their reception and treatment off the field - and especially in the north of England.

In one sense this very low level of race discussion and tension is consistent with both Mulvaney and Harcourt's account and the general views expressed by Bolt and Rich. Yet there are sufficient indicators to suggest that something of the omission was very directly linked to British perceptions That is to say that the Native team did not quite match the expectation of them as Maori and did not therefore attract the attention and comment they otherwise might. *The Times* hinted at such a view after the Surrey match when, after

---

40 Ibid, p.133.

41 *The Rochdale Times*, 20 March 1889, p.7.

noting the European presence in the team, it nevertheless concluded that they were " Maori enough ".[42] *The Field*, however, drew a much more rigid distinction between European and Maori when informing its readers that only two "natives" had appeared in the opening match - presumably a reference to Karauria and Taiaroa.[43] Directly on this point, *The Sportsman* felt that " the term "Maori" as applied to this troupe of rugby union players is something of a misnomer seeing that the combination consists of but six pure Maori, fifteen half-caste and four New Zealanders ".[44]

But most informative of all is Eyton's account of the matter.

> The British public no doubt expected to find the Maori football team (as it was so often called) to be composed of black fellows, and as we could not show anyone darker than Smiler, Karauria, Nehua, Taiaroa and Rene, who can only be said to be badly sunburned, it looked almost like a fraud to expect the British public to believe such as the Warbrick's and the Wynyard's & co. to be typical of the Maori race. We had not even a tattoo mark among the team, and in their walks abroad they attracted little or no attention from the casual passer-by.

In order to keep faith with the expectations of their public, the team, on one occasion in early November, purchased black masks and wore these as they arrived at a railway station.[45]

It seems from this that after only a month of the tour the Native team had come to be regarded far more as a legitimate sporting proposition and far less as an intriguing physical spectacle. As Eyton implies, the contrast between somewhat exaggerated notions of "black fellows" and a team of whom

---

[42] *The Times*, 4 October 1888, p.8.
[43] *The Field*, 6 October 1888, p.505. Goldsmith, whose parentage is uncertain, also appeared in this match.
[44] *The Sportsman*, 4 October 1888, p.4.
[45] Eyton, Rugby Football, p.72.

less than a quarter were full blooded Maori was a wide gap to bridge. But it may also be that sport itself had an important part to play in altering public perceptions. For in the same manner that interested parties in Britain had pointed to cricket as having had a particularly civilising effect on Aborigines,[46] such may also have been the case with Maori football. Contrary to the sensationalist connections with savagery and cannibalism which had marked the teams arrival in Britain, and to perceptions of rebellious hostility which may have stemmed from the Anglo-Maori wars of the 1860s, here at least was a group of Maori who conveyed a willingness to conform to the very British customs of the sports field and all that this entailed beyond it.

Again, evidence to sustain such arguments on a properly representative scale is lacking and they must remain in the realm of possibility rather than actuality. But whichever way one explains the relatively low level of interest in Maori aspects of the tour, it is more than likely that this had a bearing on its fluctuating popularity at the gate. With the negating of one component of Eyton's intention to provide a dual sporting and "cultural" attraction, the tour was apparently left to make its way largely on playing merit. To this end, the cost, both fiscal and human, was to become the greatest legacy of the Native team.

---

[46] Mulvaney & Harcourt, Cricket Walkabout, pp.105f.

"Punch" welcome to the Native team.

You've come then, brother Maoris,
at us to have a shy
And if we'd guard our glories
we'll have to mind our eye
Our camp you seem to flurry,
and stir its calm content
You've flabergasted Surrey,
and scrumpulated Kent

You're kicking brother Maoris,
has given us the kick,
You're well matched all, well "on the
ball"
And strong and straight and quick.
By jove this is a rum age,
when a New Zealand team
Licks Bull at goal and scrummage
it beats McCauley's dream

You're welcome, brother Maoris,
Here's wishing you good luck
With you there pace and power is
and skill and lots of pluck
A trifle "rough"? Why, just so?
but that you'll mend no doubt
And win, all sportsmen trust so,
in many a friendly bout.

The Press, 9 January 1889, p.5.

CHAPTER FOUR

Exploits and Exploitation: Players, Profits and Promoters.

p

The important themes and issues of the Native tour are of course intimately connected to its achievements on the field. It is necessary to highlight its successes, the standard of opposition and the British reaction on a purely sporting level. But, conversely, to proceed only in terms of results is to proceed superficially. Rather one must examine in detail the broader forces in achieving such results - the role of players and of promoters and the interaction between the two. In the first instance the discussion is necessarily one concerning the financial base of the tour seen in the context of more general principles relating to the growth of spectator sport and of international touring teams. Only from this can one understand the demands facing Scott and Eyton and their responses which so greatly determined the character of the tour - in particular its rigorous itinerary and the manner in which this affected the players in terms of both physical and mental well-being. The result is a far from complimentary assessment of the methods and motives of Scott and Eyton - and to an extent Joe Warbrick - as tour promoters.

Oct. 3-v. Surrey County	At Richmond	Won 4 to 1

Oct. 6-v. Northamptonshire	At Northampton	Won 12 to 0
Oct.10-v. Kent County	At Blackheath	Won 4 to 1
Oct.13-v. Moseley R.F.C	At Moseley	Lost 4 to 6
Oct.18-v.Burton-on-Trent R.F.C	At Burton-on-Trent	Lost 3 to 4
Oct.20-v. Midland Counties	At Birmingham	Won 10 to 0
Oct.22-v. Middlesex County	At Fletching	Lost 0 to 9

After a win and a draw from two matches in Melbourne while on their way to Britain, the Native team approached their opening match against Surrey with some confidence. Although without Tabby Wynyard and the still injured Joe Warbrick, the team selected for the match was a strong one which completed an efficient victory. The crowd for the match, variously estimated at 5000 and 50,000, warmed quickly to the visitors.

> The first appearance of the New Zealanders created no little excitement in the football world and Richmond was invaded by upwards of 50000 [sic] visitors, all anxious to witness the debut of the antipodeans. The leading lights of the Rugby Union fully atoned for their absence from Fenchurch St to welcome the Maoris on their arrival by attending the first match in large numbers. The enclosure was thronged by eminent footballers, while nearly all of the members of the Australian cricket team put in an appearance.[1]

If this first victory caused a certain amount of surprise, the following two - and especially that against a strong Kent side - were perhaps even more unexpected, prompting one reporter to observe that the Native team were far stronger than most had supposed them to be.[2] Conversely, the losses at Moseley and Burton-on-Trent, in an area dominated by the Association

---

[1] *The Press*, 13 November 1888, p.5.
[2] Eyton, Rugby Football, p.18.

game, caused as much surprise as the previous three successes.[3] But it was the loss to Middlesex which raised the most comment and concern. Expecting to participate in an exhibition match at Sheffield Park, home of noted sporting patron Lord Sheffield, the visitors instead found a strong County combination including several English, Scottish and Welsh internationals. Yet the heavy defeat was as much attributable to superior opposition as to the consequences of Lord Sheffield's hospitality. As a result of champagne, two players were found asleep in a shrubbery prior to the match, and Eyton described the final display as " void of combination ".[4]

Such erratic results and behaviour can hardly have impressed Eyton and Scott as providing a strong beginning to the tour. Moreover, with their move north in late October the team embarked upon a series of matches which contained some of the most potentially difficult in Britain. For by the 1880s the real strength of British rugby had shifted from the public schools and universities of the south to the northern working class areas of Yorkshire and Lancashire. From its inauguration in 1888-89, Yorkshire won seven of the first eight County Championships with Lancashire winning the other in a pattern that was only broken with the move to Northern Union (Rugby League) at the end of 1895.[5] Prior to the split the Yorkshire County Union had more than 150 clubs affiliated to it - almost

---

3 *The Press*, 3 December 1888, p.5; *Lyttelton Times*, 9 December 1888, p.2.
4 Eyton, Rugby Football, p.19.
5 Gate, Rugby League, pp.14-16.

half of the total clubs affiliated to the Rugby Football Union.[6] Indeed the importance of rugby as a community focus was such that local Yorkshire derbies attracted 6000 spectators at a time when international matches in London were drawing only 4000. As Robert Gate explains, " the populace, released briefly of a Saturday afternoon from the mind-numbing drudgery of mill and mine, derived pride, pleasure or pain from the exploits of their local team ".[7] Not surprisingly, Scott quickly recognised the potential of the north for the Native team and did all in his power to concentrate their efforts in that area.

Oct.24-v. Hull	At Hull	Lost 0 to 1
Oct.27-v. Dewsbury	At Dewsbury	Won 6 to 0
Oct.31-v. Wakefield Trinity	At Wakefield	Lost 0 to 1
Nov. 3-v. Northumberland C'ty	At Newcastle	Drew 3 to 3
Nov. 5-v. Stockton-on-Tees	Stockton-on-Tees	Won 6 to 1
Nov. 7-v. Tynemouth	At North Shields	Won 7 to 1
Nov.10-v. Halifax Free Wanderers	At Halifax	Lost 4 to 13
Nov.12-v. Newcastle and Dist.	At Newcastle	Won 14 to 0
Nov.14-v. Hartlepool Rovers	At Hartlepool	Won 1 to 0
Nov.17-v. Cumberland C'ty	At Maryport	Won 10 to 2
Nov.20-v. Carlisle	At Carlisle	Won 13 to 0
Nov.22-v. Hawick	At Hawick	Won 3 to 1
Nov.23-v. East Cumberland Clubs	At Carlisle	Won 12 to 0

[6] G. Williams in T. Mason, Ed., Sport in Britain: A Social History, Cambridge 1989, p.313.
[7] Gate, Rugby League, p.16.

Nov.24-v. Westmoreland C'ty	At Kendal	Won 3 to 1
Nov.26-v. Swinton	At Swinton	Lost 0 to 2
Nov.28-v. Liverpool and Dist.	At Liverpool	Won 9 to 0
Dec. 1-v. IRELAND	At Dublin	Won 13 to 4
Dec. 3-v. Trinity College	At Dublin	Drew 4 to 4
Dec. 5-v. North of Ireland	At Belfast	Won 2 to 0

Among this first series of northern matches, the victories against Dewsbury, Hartlepool Rovers and Hawick were particularly commendable, while the losses to Hull, Wakefield, Halifax Free Wanderers and Swinton were all against very strong opposition. The Tynemouth match marked the first appearance on tour of Joe Warbrick who played to test his foot injury but succeeded only in aggravating it.[8] Nevertheless, with eight victories in ten games the team undoubtedly approached the Irish international with confidence. But in the first half of the match at Dublin they conceded two tries and a 4-0 lead. In the second half, however, fortunes altered considerably. Brilliant play by Elliot, Keogh and McCausland in particular produced five tries in less than thirty minutes and a thoroughly convincing victory. Yet the Irish press were more content to dwell on the failings of their own team than the magnitude of the recovery. One scribe saw the match as " a very poor and easygoing exposition of football throughout, any respectable play being shown by the visitors "[9]. Another concluded " That the result shows the home team anything but

---

[8] Eyton, Rugby Football, pp.22-31; *Lyttelton Times*, 1 March 1889, p.3.
[9] *The Press*, 24 January 1889, p.6.

brilliant scorers goes without saying and seldom has an Irish international combination shown to less advantage ".[10]

Dec. 8-v. Lancashire C'ty	At Manchester	Lost 0 to 1
Dec.10-v. Batley	At Batley	Drew 5 to 5
Dec.12-v. Yorkshire C'ty	At Manningham	Won 10 to 6
Dec.15-v. Broughton Rangers	At Broughton	Won 8 to 0
Dec.17-v. Wigan	At Wigan	Won 5 to 1
Dec.19-v. Llanelly	At Llanelly	Lost 0 to 3
Dec.22-v. WALES	At Swansea	Lost 0 to 5
Dec.24-v. Swansea	At Swansea	Won 5 to 0
Dec.26-v. Newport	At Newport	Won 3 to 0
Dec.29-v.Cardiff	At Cardiff	Lost 1 to 4

Whereas the loss to a strong Lancashire side produced a minor controversy in that Eyton claimed a bad refereeing decision prevented Tabby Wynyard from kicking the winning goal,[11] the victory against Yorkshire came to be regarded as one of the best of the tour. The decision of the County Committee to send a second string XV against the Native team drew much criticism from the press but at the same time considerably enhanced the reputation of the visitors.[12] Yet at the end of the month they set a precedent for subsequent New Zealand rugby

---

10 Eyton, Rugby Football, p.35.
11 Eyton, Rugby Football, p.36.
12 Ibid, pp.37-40.

visitors in being hindered by the strength of the Welsh. In a hard fought match against Wales, simply described by the local press as " a grand display of football " the Native team had to contend with both efficient Welsh play and miserably wet Swansea weather. Yet they were by no means overwhelmed and even enjoyed the support of a large section of the crowd who objected strongly to there being only one Llanelli player and two Swansea players in the Welsh XV.[13]

At the mid-point of the tour 36 matches had been played for 22 wins, three draws and eleven losses. Among their victories the visitors could claim such important scalps as Surrey, Kent, Ireland and Yorkshire, while only the losses to Moseley and Burton-on-Trent can be regarded as against minor opposition - and it is significant that these were at the beginning of the tour. For after a shaky start in October the win/loss ratio had become much more favourable in November and December and was certainly reflected in press assessments of the team. As but two examples; *The Field* declared after the opening match against Surrey that " It may with truth be said that unless they show vast improvement they will find our best clubs too much for them ".[14] Similarly, the *Illustrated Sporting and Dramatic News* thought " our visitors, though good, sound, players, are by no means phenomenal. A crack team like Blackheath would in all probability prove too much for them ".[15] Yet by the end of the

---

[13] Ibid, pp.41-44; *The Press*, 11 February 1889, p.6; *The Cambrian*, 28 December 1888, p.3.

[14] *The Field*, 6 October 1888, p.505. See also, 13 October 1888, p.541.

[15] *Illustrated Sporting and Dramatic News*, 13 October 1888, p.125. See also, *The Times*, 4 October 1888, p.9; 23 October 1888, p.11.

year the same source was predicting that having proved themselves in the north the Native team would be a strong attraction upon return to London.[16] In the same fashion, *The Field* strongly criticised Yorkshire for sending a weakened team against such strong opposition.[17]

As to their style of play, *The Daily Telegraph* informed its readers that they should expect nothing unusual from the visitors.

> The Curious ones in the crowd ... who expected some form of unconventional "new departure" were disappointed. They play a fair orthodox rugby game, but nothing out of the common .... Suffice it to record that the New Zealanders have learnt and preserved every rule and tradition of the game.[18]

Their strength, according to most observers, was undoubtedly in forward play where they used only eight players as against the usual nine of their opposition. The backs, though acknowledged as talented, were also described as having a tendency to pass recklessly.[19]

Yet the tourists would have been well advised to savour the favourable attention they were getting. For theirs was a record and reputation fashioned at some considerable cost, and as early as November it was evident that all was not well within the Native team. Eyton and Scott were far from satisfied with the development of the tour and tensions were growing with both the Rugby Football Union and elements of the British press. To get to the heart of these problems it is

---

16 Ibid, 19 January 1889, p.515.
17 *The Field*, 15 December 1888, p.880.
18 *The Daily Telegraph*, 4 October 1888, p.8.
19 *The Press*, 13 November 1888, p.5; 13 December 1888, p.5.

necessary to establish something of a context in respect of general trends in the growth of nineteenth century sport and those who sought profit from such growth.

In its simplest terms the growth of British spectator sport is attributable to a number of structural changes within an emerging industrial society during the nineteenth century. Paramount among these were changing material and employment conditions which gave workers shorter hours and a higher disposable income - followed from the 1860s by the gradual extension of the Saturday half-holiday. Such freedoms, in combination with improved roading, rail and communication links throughout Britain, produced an increasingly mobile and committed spectatorship. In addition, increasing literacy and the growth of a popular press enabled the fostering of rivalries and focal points far beyond the focus of the traditional village outlook.[20]

Although there was certainly a tradition of efforts to exploit this new environment in such sports as boxing and horse racing, one of the most celebrated examples came in 1846 with the formation by William Clarke of a professional All-England cricket XI. Touring throughout Britain and engaging an immense variety of opposition, Clarke and his missionary band considerably enhanced both the status of cricket and their own personal fortunes. From 1852 imitators such as the United All-England XI and the United South of England XI were similarly successful until problems relating more to

---

[20] Holt, Sport and the British, pp.3,161-73; W.F. Mandle, " W.G. Grace as a Victorian hero ", Historical Studies, Vol.19, No.76, April 1981, p.353.

personality than finance saw them superseded by amateur control and a growing county structure during the 1870s.[21]

The application of the touring formula on an international scale proved equally rewarding. The first cricket tour, to North America in 1859, yielded £90 to each of its players, while those on the first tours to Australia in 1861-2 and 1863-4 received £250 and £475 respectively - although the money grabbing exploits of the later party acted to discourage Australian backing for a further tour until 1873. However, when they resumed, colonial spectators flocked to see players the like of W.G. Grace and Alfred Shaw who represented new ideals of cricketing tactics and techniques not previously seen in the colonies. In 1876-77 James Lillywhite was able to pay his players double their original guarantee, and two years later Lord Harris's party pocketed £500 each. On their first Australian venture as joint promoters in 1881-82, Shaw, Shrewsbury and Lillywhite recouped no less than £750 each followed by a substantially reduced, but still healthy, £150 in 1883-84.[22]

When the process was set in reverse after 1878 with regular Australian visits to England, profits were likewise substantial. Indeed the success of the 1878 team in this respect encouraged a number of English professionals, Arthur Shrewsbury included, to demand an improvement in their own

---

21 W.F. Mandle, " The professional cricketer in England in the nineteenth century ", Labour History, No.23, November 1972, pp.2-3.

22 Ibid, p.9; A Pullin, Alfred Shaw: his career and performances, London 1902, p.116.

conditions of employment.[23] But after 1886 the trend was significantly altered as far as tours to Australia were concerned. A combination of inter-colonial business rivalries and declining public interest after five tours in five years saw Shrewsbury and partners lose £250 each on their third Australian venture in 1886-87 Not discouraged, Shrewsbury returned with a fourth team for the 1887-88 season. But another English team under the captaincy of G.F. Vernon was also touring at the invitation of the Melbourne Cricket Club. In competition for both grounds and gates in an already declining market, both parties lost heavily - Shrewsbury as much as £1200.[24] " The least that can be said of the blunder ", recalled Alfred Shaw, " is that it was such stupendous folly a similar mistake is never likely to occur again ".[25]

Yet Shaw was still prepared to acknowledge the viability of private touring, suggesting that it was merely a matter of appropriate circumstances and judicious management.[26] Shrewsbury must have held a similar view. For in spite of the calamity, he remained in Australia to organise the British football tour of 1888 - intending to capitalise on a previously untapped winter spectatorship. That this venture also ended in failure - losing as much as £900[27] - cannot obscure the untested hopes that were held for it. Nor can it be regarded as a discouragement to the promoters of the Native tour as the

---

23 J. Pollard, Australian Cricket: The Game and its Players, North Ryde, New South Wales 1982, pp.393-404; P. Wynne-Thomas, Give me Arthur: A Biography of Arthur Shrewsbury, London 1985, pp.114-15.

24 Wynne-Thomas, Give me Arthur, pp.63-68,77-91.

25 Pullin, Alfred Shaw, p.101.

26 Ibid.

27 Chester & McMillan, The Visitors, p.41.

British team played their last game on 3 October - the same day as the opening match against Surrey.

In light of the magnitude of their undertaking, it is a safe assumption that Eyton, Scott and Warbrick were well versed in at least some part of this touring pattern and its requirements. Their London agent, S.E. Sleigh, had managed the 1884 New Zealand team to Australia - albeit on a much smaller scale - and Arthur Shrewsbury's discussions with Joe Warbrick in May 1888 are certain to have left the latter with an enhanced understanding of the likely British response. In common with previous visitors, the Native team hoped to offer a high degree of colonial competitiveness, but also, as demonstrated earlier, to tap their curiosity value. Moreover, after a surfeit of Australian cricket teams, they represented both the first sporting combination from New Zealand and the first rugby team to tour Britain.[28]

Yet even with these drawcards, the risk can now be seen as considerable. For, by comparison with cricket, a rugby tour of similar duration constituted an altogether more expensive proposition. The number of players to be provided for was much higher - 26 in the Native team as against a maximum of fourteen for the Aboriginal tour and only twelve for Shaw and Shrewsbury's first visit to Australia. The cost of travel was also much greater. While the Native team moved their larger party between 61 different venues, the Aboriginal team

---

[28] A Canadian soccer team was also visiting Britain in 1888-89.

appeared at only 41 and the first six white Australian teams a maximum of 37.[29]

Finally, in terms of spectator appeal, one must remember that rugby did not dominate as a winter code in anything like the same way that cricket dominated the summer. Even allowing for its increasing hold on the north, the oval ball code still ran a clear second to soccer as the game of mass popularity. With the formation of the Football Association in 1863, eight years before the Rugby Football Union, and the focus of an organised cup competition operating by the 1870s, soccer was able to make significant progress long before rugby was properly organised. Dunning and Sheard also suggest that a more open and less complex game had greater spectator appeal and was more easily understood and adopted by those, especially in the north, whose choice was not dictated by old school traditions. Thus, although none of the first eight all-southern F.A. Cup finals attracted more than 5000 spectators, comparable to Gate's figure of 4000 for rugby internationals during the 1870s, the first all-northern final drew 12,500 in 1884, 27,000 attended a cup tie in 1888, 45,000 saw the final of 1893 and the average final attendance over the next ten years was 80,000.[30] As will be revealed shortly, it is very much of a moot point whether Eyton and Scott were at all conversant with such limitations on the popularity of their venture.

---

[29] All figures are compiled from Swan, New Zealand Rugby Football, pp.520-1; Mulvaney, Cricket Walkabout, pp.174-82; Pollard, Australian Cricket, pp.393-404.

[30] E. Dunning & K. Sheard, Barbarians, Gentlemen and Players: A Sociological Study of the Development of Rugby Football, Canberra 1979, pp.100-1,137,184.

CHAPTER FIVE

Gentlemen and Competitors: Conflicting Interpretations of Sporting Conduct.

If the first half of the Native tour can be seen largely in terms of emerging tensions between players and promoters, the second half is best interpreted as a series of clashes between the game and its ethos. In New Zealand the team had already encountered some criticism for their on field indiscretions. In Britain, however, they were to run headlong into battle with a Rugby Football Union which professed a highly developed conception of the role of the game in society and the way it ought to be played. Beyond the field, if the battles were less well publicised, it was nevertheless evident that the tourists did not conform to standard. At the same time, though, the progress of the tour, and a number of wider comparisons, serve to demonstrate that the Native team were far from unique in the controversial position they adopted and that those who criticised their approach to the game were, themselves, not beyond reproach.

In part, the success of the Native team during January and February 1889 must be attributable to the understanding and combination that developed from constant play together. Perhaps also the standard of opposition, especially in the west of England, was not always of the calibre encountered earlier. Nevertheless some of the leading clubs, both northern and

southern, were encountered at a time when illness and injury had clearly not abated. Indeed, Scott was barely able to assemble a fit combination for the important return match against Yorkshire, and the consequent defeat by a full strength county side was the heaviest of the tour.[1]

But if Yorkshire was a setback, the period which followed was one of the most successful of the tour. Although Eyton certainly ignores the claims of Middlesex and Lancashire in describing Somerset as second only to Yorkshire among county sides, the home team did contain a number of international players and the victory was a significant achievement.[2] In playing terms, preparations for the international match against England could hardly have been better. Moreover, thankfully for the players, the postponement due to bad weather of the match against Oxford University meant that between 9 and 16 February the team had their longest non-playing period of the tour - the previous longest being five days between the fourth and fifth matches in mid-October.[3] Nevertheless it is hardly likely that even this was long enough to initiate a full recovery, and it is in this context of continuing physical and mental strain that one must view the far from graceful response to what followed.

Jan. 1-v. Bradford	At Bradford	Lost 1 to 4
Jan. 3-v. Leeds Parish Church	At Leeds	Won 6 to 3
Jan. 5-v. Kirkstall	At Kirkstall	Won 7 to 3

---

1 Eyton, Rugby Football, p.49.
2 Ibid, pp,53-57.
3 Ibid, p.61.

Jan. 7-v. Brighouse Rangers	At Brighouse	Won 4 to 0
Jan. 9-v. Huddersfield	At Huddersfield	Won 7 to 6
Jan.12-v. Stockport	At Stockport	Drew 3 to 3
Jan.14-v. Castleford	At Castleford	Lost 3 to 9
Jan.17-v. Warrington	At Warrington	Won 7 to 1
Jan.19-v. Yorkshire C'ty	At Wakefield	Lost 4 to 16
Jan.23-v. Spen Valley Dist.	At Cleckheaton	Won 8 to 7
Jan.26-v. Somersetshire C'ty	At Wellington	Won 17 to 4
Jan.30-v. Devonshire C'ty	At Exeter	Won 12 to 0
Jan.31-v. Taunton	At Taunton	Won 8 to 0
Feb. 2-v. Gloucestershire C'ty	At Gloucester	Won 4 to 1
Feb. 4-v. Midland Counties	At Moseley	Won 6 to 1
Feb. 6-v. Blackheath Rovers	At Blackheath	Won 9 to 3
Feb. 9-v. United Services	At Portsmouth	Won 10 to 0
Feb.16-v. ENGLAND	At Blackheath	Lost 0 to 7

The England international is of importance on two related levels. In itself the match provided several major controversies as members of the Native team strongly questioned refereeing decisions and exhibited behaviour which briefly placed the entire tour in jeopardy. On a wider analysis, however, these events can be used as a pivot for scrutinising the traditionally accepted Victorian notion of sportsmanship and fair play. For in the response of the British public, press and rugby officialdom throughout the tour, there are evident both contradictions and marked regional differences in attitudes to playing methods and conduct. When taken beyond the field of play, it can similarly be seen that the reception

accorded the Native team, and likewise the visitors response to their hosts, is drawn along lines between London and the north of England in particular.

For England the match was their only international encounter of the 1888-89 season due to an ongoing series of disputes with the other home unions. A controversial try in the international of 1883 produced a particularly acrimonious response from Scotland and resulted in their fixture being suspended for the following year. However, when it was suggested that an International Board be formed to resolve this and other disputes concerning the developing laws of the game, England were adamant that they would only participate on terms more favourable than those of the other countries. Their position was based on the fact that they had more clubs under their jurisdiction than any other union, but in reality it was merely a desire to stave off any Gaelic or Celtic threat to their traditional control of the game. Eventually, in 1890, after independent arbitration by the former President of the Football Association, the International Board was satisfactorily constituted with England providing half of the members in a system of threequarter-majority voting to prevent their domination. But the important point to be taken here is that, at the beginning of 1889, the Rugby Football Union still held firmly to notions of absolute supremacy as to interpretation and administration in rugby - as the Native team were soon to discover.[4]

---

[4] B. Dobbs, Edwardians at Play: Sport 1890-1914, London 1973, pp.79-83.

In bitterly cold and wet weather and in front of a fairly small crowd, Scott having failed in his bid to use the more lucrative Kensington Oval, the Native team more than held their own against England for the majority of the first half. Thereafter the fate of the match seemed to fall into the hands of the referee G. Roland Hill - Secretary of the Rugby Football Union. Exactly what transpired is difficult to discover in that most press reports offer only passing mention of a dispute without mentioning the precise circumstances. Thus one is obliged to court the risk of bias in turning to the more detailed accounts of Eyton and Ellison. In his book, The Art of Rugby Football, Ellison outlines three " distinctly erroneous and depressing decisions of the referee ".[5] The first two involved the awarding of tries to England when the ball had on both occasions apparently been carried over the dead ball line by William Warbrick and Harry Lee respectively. The third decision was of an altogether more unusual nature and involved a tackle by Ellison himself on the England Captain, A.E. Stoddart, as he ran for the try line.

> I lured him into my arms by applying the feign dodge. By a quick wriggle, however, he escaped but left a portion of his knickers in my possession. He dashed along and the crowd roared; then suddenly discovering what was the matter he stopped, threw down the ball, and in an instant we had the vulgar gaze shut off by forming a ring around him.[6]

With most of the visitors thus engaged, they were in no position to stop Frank Evershed who seized the ball and appeared to score in the corner in spite of a desperate tackle from Madigan. This was not the end of the matter. For as the

---

[5] Ellison, The Art of Rugby Football, p.68.
[6] Ibid.

Native team vigorously disputed the try amid claims that Stoddart had called "dead ball", Evershed took the opportunity to run in-field and place the ball under the posts in a more advantageous position for his goal-kicker. As Hill awarded this try, Williams, Taiaroa and Sherry Wynyard walked from the field in disgust - although Scott quickly induced them to return and finish the match.[7]

In conclusion, Ellison offered a most scathing perspective.

> I may add that gross as these errors were, they were insignificant when compared with another that Mr Hill committed at the outset of the game, viz, refereeing at all in that game; he being the most important official of the English Rugby Union, and the father of the team pitted against us.[8]

From the present distance one cannot of course attest the validity of this version of events, although the contrast of detail with rather sketchy English accounts may be revealing.

The immediate response of the Rugby Football Union was to demand a full apology from the captain of the Native team for the conduct of his players during the match. In accordance, Mac McCausland, captain in place of the injured Joe Warbrick, forwarded the following telegram from Cambridge on 20 February.

> To Roland Hill,
>
> As captain of the New Zealand team I beg to apologise to the Rugby Union committee for the insults offered by my team to their officials on the field of play on Saturday last, and beg on behalf of my team to express their regret for their behaviour on that occasion.[9]

---

7 Ibid.

8 Ibid.

9 *The Press*, 11 April 1889, p.2.

According to a later account by Joe Warbrick this was McCausland's second apology - his first having been deemed insufficient by the Rugby Football Union who insisted that unless he provided another at their dictation, the tour would effectively be ended as English players would be debarred from playing against the Native team.[10]

The motivation of the Rugby Football Union in pursuing an on-field matter to such lengths can only be understood in the context of the contemporary notions of sportsmanship and fair play embedded in the amateur ethos. From their earliest matches in Britain the Native team neither conformed to what was regarded as acceptable and respectable by the traditional powers of their game in London and the south of England, or the recognised standard which subordinated any immediately perceived sense of injustice on the field to a higher ethic of restraint and respect for the game.

Ideally the sporting tradition nurtured by the burgeoning public school system of the nineteenth century is best seen in the context of a diversity of shifting Victorian attitudes to such fundamentals as health, work, race religion and morality. But for present purposes a narrower explanation is sufficiently instructive. Returning to the elite principles of sporting imperialism outlined in chapter three, one is reminded of the increasing role of sport in the maintenance of informal authority systems and as a means of assimilation for the purposes of colonial control. Critical to this process was

---

[10] Ibid, 6 June 1889, p.5. Eyton makes no mention of the apology in his account of the match. See Eyton, Rugby Football, pp.61-3.

the training of a constant supply of young men to sustain such patterns. Especially through team sport, with its emphasis on group loyalty and competition, they would ideally be conditioned for much sterner challenges on frontiers beyond the field. Yet the competitive element being stressed here was not one geared to a popular modern notion of winning at all costs. Rather it sought to reduce the importance of success and elevate the value of participation. As Richard Holt explains,

> By teaching boys how to lose as well as how to win with dignity, the wider competitive principle was strengthened. For to succeed in any competition - sporting, academic or economic - the odds were very much that you would lose before you would win. It was vital that boys should not be discouraged by initial setbacks and that they should persevere until success finally came. There was no disgrace in losing so long as you did your best.[11]

It goes almost without saying that such an approach to sport was strictly amateur. In the conventional sense of the term, this manifested itself in an abhorrence of the idea of deriving personal material benefit from games - hence the previously mentioned hostility to both professionalism and speculation. In another sense, though, the amateur ethos represented an internal discipline and code of conduct for players whereby one adhered without question to both the written rules and the spirit of the game. One did not attempt to secure any advantage over an opponent that was not fully able to be reciprocated. This was the proper pursuit of sport as character training and as an end in itself. The true amateur was obliged to police his own behaviour regardless of the presence of a

---

[11] Holt, Sport and the British, p.97. See also, M.J. Wiener, English Culture and the Decline of the Industrial Spirit, 1850-1980, Cambridge 1981, pp.116-25; P. McIntosh, Fair Play: Ethics in Sport and Education, London 1979, pp.24-36.

referee. Indeed, Dunning and Sheard note that, well into the 1840s, public schools' football was marked by its internal control and lack of appointed officials, the assumption being that as future gentlemen of business and authority the players would not deliberately contravene the rules. And, any conflicts that arose could be satisfactorily resolved by team captains. The Corinthian Casuals, a team of ex-public school soccer players who assembled for international matches during the 1880s, epitomised this principle by withdrawing their goalkeeper if a penalty was awarded against them - on the grounds that it would be wrong to resist the consequences of a foul even if accidental. Moreover, that a penalty existed for cheating did not make it acceptable to cheat at the risk of a penalty.[12]

While ordinarily one might expect the absolute force of such ideals to have become somewhat diluted over space and time, it also has to be said that the officials of the Rugby Football Union, with their almost exclusively public school backgrounds, were far closer to the heart of the matter than anyone else. This is even more likely to have been the case during the late 1880s as those in the north developed a highly competitive interpretation of the game which viewed winning as essential. Hence there is a consciousness of the conduct of the Native team from the very beginning of the tour. *The Times* report of the Surrey match is one which perfectly captures the prevailing expectation.

---

[12] Holt, Sport and the British, pp.97-100; Dunning & Sheard, Barbarians, Gentlemen and Players, pp.96-7,147.

> We should not presume to congratulate the Maoris upon the possession of virtues which come naturally to most football players now ... We prefer, as the Maoris themselves would prefer, to take it as a matter of course that they should have borne an equal part in the admirable discipline and self-repression exhibited in yesterdays contest, the instant and unquestioning obedience rendered to umpires and the total absence of those squabbles which once made a football match anything but an unmixed pleasure.[13]

Within days the reports began to assume a far more critical nature. For the matches against Kent and Moseley in particular there are references to " a certain amount of roughness " in the play of the Native team,[14] The *Lyttelton Times* correspondent reported that Moseley justified their own rough play against the visitors on the basis of the " vicious methods " which had apparently been used against Kent.[15] For the important match against Middlesex the matter is quite explicitly stated.

> Several members of the side showed great roughness, and should be either severely lectured or left out of the matches. Of course the credit of the side is risked when one or two of its members are allowed to conduct themselves in anything but a gentlemanly way.[16]

In early November, *Punch* entered the fray with a mock match report of a game under "Thugby Association" rules between "Midland Yahoos" and "North Country Savages" accompanied by a cartoon of John Bull declaring " Play football by all means my boy - but don't let it be this brutal sort of thing ".[17] In form this is not a specific reference to the Native team, but its timing suggests a clear prompting.

---

13 *The Times*, 4 October 1888, p.9.
14 See for example, *The Times*, 11 October 1888, p.6; 15 October 1888, p.7; 23 October 1888, p.11; *The Field*, 13 October 1888, p.541.
15 *Lyttelton Times*, 19 December 1888, p.2.
16 *The Field*, 27 October 1888, p.621.
17 *The Press*, 13 December 1888, p.6.

For the months of November, December and January the incidence of such accounts is virtually non existent as the team moved mainly through the north of England - an omission which will be fully discussed in due course. Yet the reaction to the walk-off and to the general behaviour of the Native team during the England international clearly demonstrates that the feelings of the London press at least had not altered during the tour. Although printed in the northern *Bradford Observer*, one of the most vehement attacks was nevertheless the work of a London correspondent.

> Saturday's match at Blackheath was entirely marred by the disreputable behaviour of the Maoris who conducted themselves in such a manner as to call forth the well merited censure of the spectators and everybody concerned. They not only disputed nearly every advantage gained by their opponents, but levelled abuse of the lowest type at the umpire and referee throughout the game .... Such an exhibition of rowdyism was never witnessed at Blackheath and the Rugby Union members present took no pains to conceal their disgust, while the spectators became irritated beyond measure at the unusual display of ill-feeling in a match of this class.[18]

The Field was inclined to take a broader view of proceedings.

> It was a display of temper which happily had no worse effect than to add to the reputation already gained by some of the visitors for unsportsmanlike conduct. To dispute the decision of the referee is bad enough, but to leave the field simply because of an adverse decision is nearly the worst form that a football player can be guilty of.[19]

Writing in 1894, noted rugby historian Frank Marshall, who was almost certainly present at the game, commended the Native team for their general play on the tour and against England in particular, but concluded that they had marred their performance by a most " childish and unsportsmanlike " display. Furthermore, he felt that the demand of the Rugby

---

[18] *Bradford Observer*, 23 February 1889, p.5.
[19] *The Field*, 23 February 1889, p.272.

Football Union for an apology following the behaviour of the Native team against England was a most distasteful step.

> But the principles of the game have always been of the first importance in the minds of the union committee. It might seem ungracious to treat visitors in this manner, especially as a prohibition of the union meant a collapse of the tour, but the fundamental principles underlying the office of the referee, viz, that his decisions on matters of fact are indisputable, and that his person is inviolable from either violence or insult, have been upheld constantly by the committee.[20]

Soon after the international *The Field* again attacked the team for their performance against London Welsh.

> Were the example set on Monday at Richmond by the New Zealanders ... to be followed by our own players, the number of those by whom football is viewed with disfavour would soon show a marked increase... much of the tackling was of a character to be decried ... on occasion the play became of an exceedingly rough and most undesirable description.[21]

In sum, the Native team had failed to impress. The team's play was characterised as unduly aggressive. Their attitude, which appeared to subordinate the principles by which one ought to play the game and replaced them with a disagreeable and hostile competitiveness, questioned the integrity of both opponents and officials.

Yet when one searches beyond London for such views, one searches in vain. The northern press simply had little to say, critical or otherwise, about the on field behaviour of the tourists - implying that it was not regarded as unusual. The only critical strain to emerge anywhere outside London was in a small number of reports following the England international - and almost all of these were written by London-based

---

[20] Marshall, Football, p.506. See also the views of Owen. L. Owen, quoted in McCarthy, Haka: The All Black Story, p.19.

[21] quoted, *The Press*, 11 April 1889, p.2.

correspondents.[22] There is, of course, a difficulty in drawing solid conclusions from omissions in that they cannot generally be taken as either positive or negative indicators. In this instance, however, it is revealing that the northern press were providing the same type of local match report as their southern counterparts and therefore had exactly the same opportunities to draw attention to on field misconduct. Further, some northern papers commended the tourist's approach to the game. The *Athletic News* of Manchester, as early as October, declared that the play of the visitors was hard rather than rough and that such a distinction should always be kept in mind by spectators.[23] Most favourable of all was the report following the first match against Widnes in March.

> Whatever has been said ... [about] the conduct of these veterans of football, they are to be complimented upon the manner in which they acted at Widnes .... The universal opinion of spectators was to one effect - that they could not have seen fairer play shown by any team ... and the whole thing passed off with more tranquility than usual.[24]

As a result of this reception, a return match was arranged.

Sentiments of this kind are certainly consistent with Eyton's recollection that " the sporting press of Manchester became almost members of the Maori brotherhood, and on the whole there was no need to complain that we were not fairly criticised ".[25] As we shall see later, this view was entirely

---

[22] See for example the views of the *Athletic News* and *Manchester Sporting Chronicle* in *The Press*, 16 April 1889, p.3. By contrast, two London papers, *The Daily News* and *The Star* were critical of Roland Hill and England, the later accusing the home team of "sharp practice". See *The Press*, 16 April 1889, p.3.

[23] *Athletic News*, 11 October 1888, p.1; 23 October 1888, p.1.

[24] *The Runcorn Guardian*, 13 March 1889, p.8.

[25] Eyton, Rugby Football, p.77. See also the positive views expressed by Pie Wynyard in Eyton, p.115.

consistent with the feelings of the team as to how they were received off the field.

This response is at least in part to be explained by the quite different class and geographical emphasis of rugby in the north. Initially the northern game had followed convention in drawing impetus from upper middle class public school old boys, such as the old Rugbeans who founded Liverpool R.F.C. and other Lancashire clubs during the early 1860s. But it was quickly to assume a far more cosmopolitan nature with clubs incorporating members from throughout the social scale. Dunning and Sheard suggest that this can, in some part, be traced to the different occupational structure of the north. A rapidly growing industrial community built around manufacturing and mining, the area naturally contained a greater proportion of both businessmen and working men employed in industry, and conversely a lesser proportion of those who could be termed "gentlemen" or of the professions. In the 1880s the majority of firms were nonetheless still small and sustained workplace interaction between employers and employees remained the norm. A foundation was thus established for a lack of class exclusiveness which extended beyond the factory to day-to-day life and naturally to the sports field.[26]

A second stimulus to working class participation can perhaps be seen in the ambiguous position of leading rugby figures in many northern communities. While on the one hand they were amassing sufficient industrial fortunes to be considered part

---

[26] Dunning & Sheard, Barbarians, Gentlemen and Players, pp.141; See also Gate, Rugby League, pp.14-16.

of the upper middle class, who were doing most to establish rugby, they nevertheless lacked the status and acceptability of "gentlemen". Until this was achieved, especially by sending their sons to public schools, they tended to maintain links with their community and class of origin. Their newly founded clubs were far more able to incorporate ordinary working people who, as discussed in the previous chapter, were increasingly possessed of the leisure time and disposable income to pursue sporting interests.[27]

Irrespective of a comprehensive explanation, the undeniable fact of a substantially higher working class participation in northern rugby, and in Welsh rugby, had a significant bearing on the structure and playing of the game in those areas - and especially its competitiveness. Whereas players of public school origin can be seen as pursuing their game for an elitist ideal, those in the north came increasingly to participate as members of identifiable communities. Players of the mining and mill towns were frequently drawn together by the economic interdependence of a single industry, and with the preclusive cost of travel in relation to incomes they tended to possess an "inner-directed" world view which emphasised strong local loyalties. Their games against similarly constituted teams assumed an intensity whereby success became a matter of pride and status for one's locality. Strong community identification with the team meant that players were obliged to practice and participate less for their own enjoyment than for the serious pursuit of victory. Central to

---

[27] Dunning & Sheard, Barbarians, Gentlemen and Players, pp.141-2.

this development was the introduction, in 1876, of the Yorkshire Challenge Cup, which within a decade had become the focal point of Yorkshire rugby. As Dunning and Sheard explain, " The Cup ties attracted large partisan crowds which identified strongly with their representatives on the field, seeing matches not just as exciting spectacles, but as tests of virility between their community and another ".[28]

One can see, then, an obvious point of friction with the Rugby Football Union whose committee strongly opposed cup rugby on the grounds that it encouraged an over-emphasis on the pursuit of victory and a downgrading of the higher ideals of leisure. Such competitiveness also encouraged violence and "ungentlemanly conduct". Roland Hill, in 1882, presented the establishment view in unequivocal terms:

> We believe that in some cases these matches have caused an evil spirit to arise, and that sometimes men are influenced more by the desire to win than to play the game in the true spirit. We are told that men intentionally play "unfairly" because it pays to do so. If such is the case, it is certainly a most melancholy fact.[29]

Whether the term "pays to do so" is merely a reference to on field success or to the wider concern with incipient professionalism is a moot point. Moreover, while such criticism is couched in terms which convey the interest of the game itself as the apparent priority, it is evident that the issue ran much deeper. The public school ethic could not and would not find an accommodation for the new and different classes who were coming not merely to embrace its game but

---

28 Ibid, pp.142-44; Gate, Rugby League, pp.16-17.

29 Dunning & Sheard, Barbarians, Gentlemen and Players, p.156.

also to dominate it in terms of both numbers and success.[30] Put simply, one can point to an established tradition of snobbery and regional hostility which was by no means exclusive to rugby.

From the contrasts presented here it is an easy step to understanding the different responses encountered by the Native team. In a northern environment far more attuned to the necessities of vigorous play, where one tended to follow the letter more than the spirit of the law, the methods of the tourists appeared normal. Indeed, with the emphasis placed on winning, one might expect that if the Native team had achieved its results in the north by anything other than an accepted method, the northern press would have been quick to respond in terms similar to those of the south. What some saw as roughness in Native team play was easily accommodated within the fabric of northern rugby.

One might also find a wider explanation within the ethos of masculinity, physical toughness and strength that dominated the occupational structure of the north. Among workers such as miners and those in heavy industry, rugby perhaps gained acceptance ahead of soccer because it embodied physical values essential to everyday survival in the workplace. The conditioning to on-field "roughness" may have been considerably greater than for "gentlemen" who emerged from a background with little or no physical emphasis.[31] Ultimately, however, one must tread cautiously with such explanations in

---

30 Gate, Rugby League, pp.13-21; Dunning & Sheard, Barbarians, Gentlemen and Players, pp.153-50.

31 Dunning & Sheard, Barbarians, Gentlemen and Players, pp.137-8.

that they lack a substantial body of solid evidence and do not allow fully for the fact that, even in the 1880s, some northern clubs were still closely linked to their "gentlemanly" founders of the 1860s and may therefore have held different expectations as to playing conduct.

But it is inescapable that the patterns of response indicated for the Native team are entirely consistent with the more general pattern of tensions between the southern and northern components of rugby during this period. Yet their position within this division reveals a possible contradiction. For in origin New Zealand rugby has traditionally been traced to quite clear networks established by public school old boys. What is generally held to have been the first game under rugby rules in the colony, played at Nelson in 1870, was inspired in large part by Charles Monro - recently returned from Sherbourne College. The game in Dunedin took root under the direction of George Sale, the son of a Rugby master and one of the original sixth formers who had penned "The Laws of Football as Played at Rugby School" in 1845. Similarly in Auckland, C.G.R. Gore and C.B. Mercer, old boys of Wellington College, England, were instrumental in persuading the local clubs to change from Victorian to Rugby rules. In time, old boys of the newly established New Zealand schools, such as Nelson College and Wellington College, were to play an equally important part in spreading the game throughout the colony.[32] But far from embracing such public school connections, and by implication

---

[32] Phillips, A Man's Country, pp.88-91; Swan, History of New Zealand Rugby Football, passim.

the ideals that accompanied them, the Native team came firmly to identify with the recalcitrant camp of British rugby.

A statement from Tom Ellison in 1902 offers a clear indication the perhaps the founders of the game in New Zealand were not entirely successful in transporting the appropriate rugby ethos to the colony.

> As regards referee's decisions, I am and I have always been, inclined to make large allowances for their frailties and to support them even to the length of conceding the commission of excusable mistakes, but this is surely the utmost limit that one can go. At any rate, I shall always consider myself entitled to raise my voice against any wrong decisions by any referee, whoever he may be, that goes beyond the bounds of a reasonable or excusable mistake. For it would be asking too much of poor human nature to expect footballers to passively submit to all and any kind of decision that a referee may make, particularly when they are palpably wrong.[33]

This was clearly a tricky distinction and an unexpected one from a footballer who had attended Te Aute College, captained New Zealand in 1893 and played a leading role in the formation of the New Zealand Rugby Football Union. It was a direct challenge to the generally accepted English view summarised by Frank Marshall's ideal of referees as sole arbitrators on matters of fact who were " involable [sic] from either violence or insult ". It is perhaps the case that although the public school old boys had made their mark on New Zealand in terms of the code of football to be played, they lacked the overall numbers and influence to impose their "higher traditions" in a new and relatively egalitarian society. Many of the players who joined the gentleman on the playing fields during the early 1870s, far from being of similar class and training, were more likely to have been manual workers or

---

[33] Ellison, The Art of Rugby Football, p.69.

Tom Ellison

miners who had previously played the Victorian code or less defined forms of football during the 1860s. Moreover, while the old boys continued to exert an influence in the larger centres of population, it is likely that many of those who took rugby to the "frontier" settlements of New Zealand were its newer colonial converts who were not imbued with the same sense of tradition and higher purpose. When looking to this rigorous pioneering environment, Dunning and Sheard's argument that rugby gained popularity in the north of England due to its greater emphasis on physical strength may also be applicable to New Zealand. A further parallel emerges in that the establishment of more efficient rail and roading networks during the 1870s enabled contacts between a much wider variety of teams and therefore a more effective competitive structure. Rugby thus became an essential element in fostering identity and pride among newly established communities.[34] Seen in this context, Ellison's view and the overall identification of the Native team with the north is quite understandable. Yet one must also bear in mind the simpler possibility that the approach was also determined, in part, by the dynamics of the tour. The speculative nature of the venture, and the consequent need to win in order to maintain an appealing spectacle, may have encouraged a less than compromising approach to the game. The rigorous selection policy outlined earlier certainly suggests a keenly developed inclination to win.

---

[34] See Phillips, A Man's Country, pp.91-4.

It is, however, misleading to derive final conclusions about the Native team from their willingness or otherwise to conform to an elite ideal of sportsmanship. For as much as they did not match the expectations of the Rugby Football Union, one can also ask a number of questions as to whether that body and its supporters were entirely beyond reproach in maintaining the code of behaviour they espoused. Certainly the soured relationship with Scotland during the 1880s, culminating in a refusal to play international matches, is proof that the Rugby Football Union was no stranger to controversy derived from events on the field. Perhaps the ideal of the gentlemanly resolution of disputes and unflinching acceptance of refereeing decisions was as problematic in Britain as elsewhere.

Speaking at a dinner after the team's return to Melbourne, Joe Warbrick readily expressed their disillusion with the standard and integrity of English match officials. Indeed, during the very first match against Surrey the team had been warned by the touring Australian cricketers to expect considerable difficulties and suspect interpretations. Furthermore, Warbrick said that although some people had regarded certain aspects of the behaviour of the British team in New Zealand as objectionable, no action had been taken similar to that of the Rugby Football Union in demanding an apology from the Native team. In fact, in a country he thought was the home of chivalry, Warbrick found much to fault in both opponents and spectators. " As long as they were losing they were jolly good fellows in the eyes of the crowd. But as soon as they commenced to win they were hooted and the papers

were full of the weakness of the home side and the rough play of the visitors ".[35] The *Lyttelton Times* correspondent presented a similar view of English fickleness concerning rough play. While a Maryport player had suffered a fractured jaw and a Blackheath player a fractured collar bone, for the tourists "there is scarcely a member of their team who has not at one time been pretty seriously bent or broken in fact in Lancashire Scott could not raise a sound fifteen ".[36]

In the end, though, such distinctions are far more the domain of independent observers. The immediate reality for the Native team was that rightly or wrongly their conduct was regarded by the Rugby Football Union as a contravention of its professed standard. As we shall see later, this was to manifest itself in further displays of animosity when the team returned to London for their last tour match after a long period in the north. For the moment, however, the contrasts and divisions need to be tested in another context - that of the reception and treatment of the Native team off the field. In its basic form this reveals a straightforward continuity with the playing pattern of the tour. But at the same time it unearths intriguing perspectives on what can be termed the "civilising process" in rugby whereby its administrators sought to extend their control to areas beyond the strict bounds of the field and the actual playing of the game. Aspects of the behaviour of the Native team, and more particularly Eyton's recollection of

---

[35] See *Lyttelton Times*, 7 March 1889, p.3; *The Press*, 24 May 1889, p.5; 3 June 1889, p.2; 6 June 1889, p.5.
[36] *Lyttelton Times*, 16 April 1889, p.3.

them, leave room to question whether this process was entirely successful or even pursued with great vigour.

As Tom Ellison recalled;

> Perhaps the most delightful part of our experiences were tasted not so much on the field as off it. On the voyage, landing at foreign ports, sight seeing, and as guests of private people, football unions and clubs (although not many of them) large manufactuory proprietories, and last but not least, of theatre managers.[37]

Eyton's decidedly tongue-in-cheek view was in similar vein. " One would need to have graduated in New Zealand as a Minister of the Government of the present day to be proof against any ill effects from the numerous banquets offered us ".[38] Indeed the extent of hospitality was such that the team were obliged to decline many invitations. Yet those they accepted were certainly of a diverse nature - including cotton and woollen mills, glass factories, shipbuilding yards, a pen factory and the Guinness Brewery in Dublin. In addition, Scott was able to obtain numerous free tickets to the theatre and music halls, as well as visits to areas generally not open to the public such as St Thomas' Hospital, the Bank of England and Trinity College, Dublin. At other times the team attended athletic meetings, such as at Manchester where Eyton reported them as being unimpressed with the play of a touring American baseball team.[39]

Of the individual clubs and post match receptions, Eyton rather cynically suggested that the best came from those who

---

37 Ellison, The Art of Rugby Football, pp.64-5.

38 Eyton, Rugby Football, p.73.

39 Ibid, pp.73-5.

had defeated the visitors.[40] Yet Joe Warbrick offered only praise for his hosts.

> My impression of England and its people during the tour was a very favourable one, more especially does this apply to private individuals. I found them everywhere very kind and attentive and apparently anxious to make ones visit as pleasant as possible, never failing to show you anything that was of interest, historical or otherwise. This attention and thoughtfulness was apparent everywhere I went and created in me no little surprise as I had often heard that the English people were noted for their exclusiveness.[41]

The singling out of "private individuals" is undoubtedly aimed at the hostile stance of both the London press and the Rugby Football Union. Eyton's preference for certain banquets and receptions reveals the same north/south dichotomy. The list of those he recalls as being particularly enjoyable is interesting for its consistency - Stockton-on-Tees, Hartlepool, Cumberland, Hawick, Wigan, Llanelly, Bradford, Cambridge, Warrington and Widnes. With the exception of Hawick and Cambridge, the remainder are Welsh and northern clubs.[42] Pie Wynyard also offers especially fond memories of his time in Manchester and Ireland and of Christmas in Wales.[43]

In the end, though, not even this amount of goodwill could compensate for the strains of the tour in other areas. In an interview at the time of his early return to New Zealand, David Gage said that although the team had enjoyed the trip and been well received, the fatigue and anxiety caused by their itinerary had removed much of the polish.[44] Scott, as early as

---

40 Ibid, p.72.
41 Warbrick, Ibid, p.111.
42 Ibid, pp.24,25,29,41,47,49,65.
43 Wynyard, Ibid, pp.115-16.
44 *The Press*, 24 May 1889, p.5.

November, had become tired of the social obligations of the team,[45] and Eyton with hindsight expressed a similar feeling.

> Speechifying became monotonous. The referee was invariably the best we had met with, the local team were the best players and the nicest fellows, the umpires did their duty most effectively, the captains of both teams were splendid fellows, and so on repeated at each place visited. The songs were good, bad and indifferent.[46]

As the tour progressed, the players were inclined to spend their non-playing days sitting over the fire playing cards or billiards - leading George Williams to a positive recollection of his team mates. " Socially, they were quiet and well behaved, and would have shown a good example to Europeans in their general conduct on and off the field ".[47]

The point Williams makes here should not be treated lightly. For increasingly during the late nineteenth century sporting administrators, and especially those in rugby, were moving to establish a wider domain of control over player behaviour. If sport was to serve a purpose beyond simple recreation, and if rugby was to counter accusations of barbarism, it was as much a matter of standardising the rules as curbing associated excesses such as swearing, drinking and gambling. To this end, the earliest disciplinary clauses of the New Zealand Rugby Football Union extended their jurisdiction beyond the field of play and sought to " discourage betting and lavish expenditure on the entertainment of teams ".[48] Further, in 1897, the Taranaki Union suggested that " the captain of the New Zealand team be a steady man and one who will be

---

45 *Lyttelton Times*, 12 February 1889, p.2.
46 Eyton, Rugby Football, p.73.
47 Williams, Ibid, p.91.
48 Swan, History of New Zealand Rugby Football, p.126.

able to keep the men well in hand in order that the prestige of New Zealand, as regards behaviour as well as skill, may be retained ".[49] Later, on the 1905 All Black tour, this trend revealed itself in constant assurances that the team had behaved as "true gentlemen". Premier Richard Seddon quoted a letter from William Pember Reeves in which he " bore testimony to the admirable personal conduct of the members of the team off the field as well as on ".[50] Team manager George Dixon also insisted that the party had " behaved as people of New Zealand would have them behave ".[51]

Mindful of such emerging sentiments in the 1880s, Joe Warbrick was quick to offer a reassuring prediction for the Native tour. Responding to a speech shortly before the departure of the team from Napier, in June 1888, he insisted that

> whatever they did on the field, they would do nothing off it unworthy of representatives of New Zealand, and he was sure that the charges levelled against some teams who had visited the old country should not be levelled against the Native footballers.[52]

Others in the colony predicted a similar path for the team, and especially on the matter of alcohol. Writing in the London *Daily Chronicle* at least a month prior to the arrival of the team in Britain, a Mr Hilton declared that the visitors would be "abstainers" as they were bound by an agreement not to take "strong drink". Further, a group of New Zealand gentlemen had apparently written to Hilton asking that he, through the press,

---

49 Phillips, A Man's Country, p.126.
50 Ibid, p.122.
51 Ibid.
52 *Lyttelton Times*, 21 July 1888, p.3.

discourage British people from offering the Native team any temptation to drink.[53] Whether this was a concern for rugby or an expression of a wider nineteenth century attitude to the consumption of alcohol by "native" people remains unclear. Yet a comparison with the Aboriginal tour shows at least a precedent for concern. In 1867 the Central Board for the Protection of Aborigines launched a stinging attack on the promoters of the tour, accusing them of exploitation for sordid gain and predicting that the players would be vulnerable to all manner of excesses. Indeed during the teams first internal tour in 1866 it was reported that alcohol contributed to the declining health of many players and to the eventual death of two. The subsequent playing standard of the team in Britain and Australia reveals that the problem did not reach the proportion that many had feared, although a press report in Sheffield did suggest a " predeliction for firewater and a natural indolence [as] some of the problems with which the management had to contend ".[54] One player was arrested for assaulting two policemen while drunk and their is evidence that another had a serious drinking problem during part of the tour. Not surprisingly, the Central Board remained critical to the end.[55]

The drinking "problem" of the Native team in 1888-89 emerges as a comparatively minor affair. Perhaps the growing perception of the team as less than authentically Maori played some part in diverting the attention of those who looked for

---

53 *New Zealand Referee*, 5 October 1888, p.235. Eyton does not make any reference to an agreement along these lines.

54 Mulvaney & Harcourt, Cricket Walkabout, p.77.

55 Mulvaney & Harcourt, Cricket Walkabout, pp.55f,64-5,77-9,132,143-44.

vulnerable natives weakened by European vice. Nevertheless, there is ample evidence that the Native team indulged themselves in a manner entirely consistent with later touring teams but entirely inconsistent with the professed ideal of their ruling body. The first incident to emerge was from the match against Middlesex on 22 October. Following a champagne luncheon prior to the match, two players were found asleep in a shrubbery when the teams were being assembled for a photograph. Although both were eventually roused for the occasion, Eyton remarked that the champagne served to handicap the play of the team to the point where it was " void of combination, though individuals played well ".[56] As the *Lyttelton Times* correspondent described the affair;

> The less said about the match from a playing point of view the better. English footballers are accustomed to smart lunches on special occasions before the game commences, and take good care to be strictly abstemious. To the Maoris, however, the departure was a new one and it cannot be denied that they innocently made the most of the many good things Lord Sheffield's genuine hospitality provided.[57]

Six weeks later a potentially more serious incident occurred at Belfast. A member of the team, not named by Eyton, became involved in an altercation on the wharf and was promptly arrested. Attempts by management to gain his release were met by abuse from the player - perhaps suggesting drunkenness - and he was therefore allowed to "cool off" over night in a police cell. Eventually he was released with only a light penalty due to the intervention of a police Inspector who was also a member of the local rugby union. That this incident

---

[56] Eyton, Rugby Football, p.19.

[57] *Lyttelton Times*, 19 December 1888, p.2.

occurred after a "banquet" may also provide some hint as to its nature.[58] Alcohol also played a part in the loss to Oxford University on 20 February 1889. " Festivities at Cambridge the night before had not done our boys much good; as Oxford University, though not an extra strong team, managed to win ".[59]

After overwhelming hospitality in Birmingham, the *Lyttelton Times* correspondent drew attention to an ongoing problem. " All day long too over-hospitable citizens were inviting them to "liquor-up". Indeed, how to avoid the constant lushing without giving offence has so far been one of the most difficult problems the New Zealanders have had to face ".[60] Also revealing is the response of George Williams to a suggestion that certain of the major tour losses could have been reversed with a less strenuous itinerary. Although denying that any attempt was made to curb the behaviour of the team, his view is possibly one derived from experience.

> Longer spells and idleness means greater temptation to riotous living, and excesses of all kinds will be the *bete noir* of all travelling football teams. No attempt in particular was made to keep the Native team in check. Restriction would perhaps be worse than full liberty to spend spare time as they liked.[61]

Finally, it is commonly held that the Auckland back Bill Elliot earned his nickname "Mother" precisely because of his endeavours on the Native tour to control those who had " gone astray ".[62]

---

58 Ibid, p.36.

59 Ibid, p.64.

60 *Lyttelton Times*, 19 December 1888, p.2.

61 Williams in Eyton, Rugby Football, p.91.

62 W. Elliot, obituary, A.C. Swan, R. Masters, A.H. Carman, The Rugby Almanack of New Zealand: 1958, Wellington 1959,p.163.

One cannot be at all surprised by such behaviour from a touring sports team, and nor is there any reason to believe that this was the complete version. Former All Black Chris Laidlaw has revealed an extensive pattern of indiscretions by international touring teams over a long period and suggests that the behaviour of Keith Murdoch, the only player to be dismissed from a tour, was mild by degree. The only problem for Murdoch was the collapse of the veil of secrecy which normally shielded such activities from the public eye.[63] In this context, the relative openness with which Eyton alludes to breaches of conduct is rather surprising. Remembering that his account of the tour was written in 1894, two years after the formation of the New Zealand Rugby Football Union, Eyton appears to court possible criticism of his and Scott's management of the tour by discussing elements of behaviour which ran contrary to an apparently determined stance from the Union. Moreover, if the potential for a "Maori drinking" controversy is accepted, the position becomes doubly contradictory.

The likely explanation for this is twofold. As with the gentlemanly ideal of sportsmanship in Britain, the policing of off field conduct in New Zealand was perhaps not yet endorsed with the vigour that the founders of the New Zealand Rugby Football Union might have hoped, and the appropriate mechanisms for keeping the traditional excesses of rugby players from public view had not yet been developed. During the mid 1890s, and as late as 1905, the Union was still

---

63 Laidlaw, Mud in Your Eye, passim.

struggling to curb such things as bad language on the field and the rough play of a Wellington provincial team dubbed "the butchers" in 1897.[64] Eyton, who had earlier operated beyond the scope of the provincial union's, and sought to portray their initial approach to the Native tour as more hostile than it really was, perhaps saw little harm in presenting elements of a public, but not public school, perception of rugby. This is also reinforced in responses to the champagne festivities preceding the Middlesex match and the "constant lushing" in Birmingham. The tone of the *Lyttelton Times* correspondent on these matters is entirely uncritical and his reports did not raise the slightest ripple when they reached New Zealand in December 1888. Likewise the British press offer nothing by way of searching criticism in explaining the inept play of the Native team against Middlesex. Furthermore, that Eyton even mentions the champagne incident or the arrest in Belfast is evidence enough that he saw little danger in doing so. While the official civilising process in rugby had made huge strides in turning back the criticisms of the 1870s it had by no means approached the puritanical tag accorded the 1905 team or the kneejerk reaction to Murdoch in 1972-3.

In sum, there are many aspects of the Native tour which stand outside expressed ideals of conduct both on and off the field. That the team were far from alone in assuming this position is also without doubt. For in the final stages of the British tour, almost entirely in Lancashire, they enjoyed some of their most successful play and best receptions. Again,

---

64 Phillips, A Man's Country, p.124.

though, the reaction to the final match of the tour against Southern Counties proved that certain opinions had not shifted and that the Rugby Football Union did not forgive easily.

The match was initially in danger of cancellation after Surrey, Middlesex, London Scottish and United Hospitals all declined to provide opposition. As it was, the Southern Counties team was hardly worthy of its designation, prompting strong criticism from the *Lyttelton Times* correspondent. " The Rugby Union, I am ashamed to say, has allowed the New Zealanders to leave without offering them the faintest valedictory hospitality. The lack of courtesy with which the team has from first to last been treated in London has been scandalous ".[65] *The Sportsman* also expressed a degree of sympathy for the visitors, and highlighted the change in attitude by the Rugby Football Union.

> [W]ithout wishing for one moment to defend the behaviour of certain of the players at Blackheath last month, some pity could not but be expressed that the farewell engagement of the dusky colonials should be brought off without the kindly countenance of the rugby governing body, who in the arrangement of the programme had at the outset done their level best to render the tour a success.[66]

But on 30 March *The Field* accompanied its report of the match with a lengthly and generally critical summary of the tour as a whole in which it suggested that the Native team had failed in all respects to match the expectations that had been held for the tour in terms of both influence and conduct.

> Their visit had been looked forward to with a good deal of pleasure. A report had certainly come forth that our dusky brothers were in the habit of playing a very rough game, but this was not altogether believed in. There

---

[65] *Lyttelton Times*, 4 June 1889, p.3.
[66] *The Sportsman*, 28 March 1889, p.4.

> was a greater tendency to hope, if not absolutely to believe that the tour of the New Zealanders might do as much to benefit the popular winter game as the visits of the Australian cricketers had done for the national summer pasttime. That this hope has been realised can scarcely be said; indeed we have heard no wish expressed that another team from the same quarter may soon be with us.[67]

Further, the same source felt that while attendances for the tour had been good, they were by no means comparable to those for early cricket visits to Britain. In fact the disparity was more significant in light of the much larger football crowds which were now common in the north and Midlands. Again, this was directly attributable to the impression created by the Native team.

> The reason for this lack of more than ordinary interest will, we think, be found to rest with the players themselves. The conduct of some members of the team in several of the early matches proved the rumour had not lied. It was plainly shown that the education of these men had been obtained in a bad school. Their knowledge of all that is unfair surpassed their acquaintance with the legitimate game, and that is saying a great deal, for as a team the New Zealanders were an exceedingly good lot showing far superior form to what had been expected. The indulgence in these malpractices drew forth much unfavourable criticism, and also deterred many from attending the New Zealanders matches who would otherwise have done so.[68]

Finally, and rather surprisingly in view of the very low level of race comment which had marked the tour, the writer endorsed a suggestion by Scott that any future tour would be better without Maori players. " If by the elimination of that element the objectionable features are removed, the team may anticipate a most hearty reception ".[69]

In reply, Scott said that he felt hurt at the attitude of the Rugby Football Union and the player boycott of the last match. In accordance with the wishes of the union a most abject

---

67 *The Field*, 30 March 1889, p.451.
68 Ibid.
69 Ibid.

apology had been given after the events at Blackheath and the past should therefore have been forgotten. While he did not necessarily excuse the behaviour of some players, Scott insisted that conduct had been very good in the vast majority of matches and that he had letters to this affect from Oxford and Cambridge universities and United Services.[70] Finally, in view of the heavy programme and much travelling, Scott was pleased with the overall results of the tour and thanked the Rugby Football Union for their part in making it possible.[71]

Feb.18-v. London Welsh	At Richmond	Won 2 to 1
Feb.19-v. Cambridge University	At Cambridge	Lost 3 to 7
Feb.21-v. Oxford University	At Oxford	Lost 0 to 6
Feb.23-v. Manningham	At Manningham	Won 4 to 0
Feb.25-v. St Johns (Leeds)	At Leeds	Won 9-0
Feb.27-v. Leigh	At Leigh	Lost 1 to 4
Mar. 2-v. Runcorn	At Runcorn	Won 8 to 3
Mar. 4-v. Oldham	At Oldham	Lost 0 to 6
Mar. 5-v. Halifax Free Wanderers	At Halifax	Won 6 to 0
Mar. 7-v. Barrow and Dist.	At Barrow	Lost 0 to 3
Mar. 9-v. Widnes	At Widnes	Won 8 to 1
Mar.11-v. Manchester	At Manchester	Won 7 to 1
Mar.13-v. Walkden	At Walkden	Won 6 to 1

70 *The Sportsman*, 28 March 1889, p.4.
71 *The Sporting Life*, 28 March 1889, p.4.

Mar.14-v. St Helen's	At St Helen's	Won 9 to 0
Mar.16-v. Salford	At Salford	Won 7 to 1
Mar.18-v. Rochdale Hornets	At Rochdale	Won 10 to 0
Mar.20-v. York	At York	Won 4 to 3
Mar.23-v. Hull	At Hull	Drew 1 to 1
Mar.25-v. Widnes	At Widnes	Won 6 to 1
Mar.27-v. Southern Counties	At Leyton	Won 3 to 1

To complete such an intensive tour with twenty matches in 39 days is further testimony to the great endurance of the Native team. Moreover following their last defeat in Britain, against Barrow and District on 7 March, the tourists embarked on a sequence as remarkable as any in the annals of international rugby history. From the victory against Widnes to that against Wellington on 20 August they completed no less than 30 victories and a draw in 31 rugby matches in Britain, Australia and New Zealand. During the last three weeks in Britain only eight scores were conceded in ten matches at a time when the casualty list was again climbing. For the match against Walkden Eyton records that such important players as Ellison, Elliot, Keogh, William Warbrick, Tabby Wynyard and Gage were all unavailable.[72] Yet if not for the draw against Hull the tour record would have been an unprecedented 50 victories. As it stands, 49 wins, five draws and twenty losses is proof beyond description that the Native team had thoroughly mastered the playing standard of their period.

---

[72] Eyton, Rugby Football, p.66.

The departure of the team from Britain on 29 March was surrounded by mixed feelings. If the London sporting elite was unrelenting in its criticisms, most of England, Ireland and Wales had found few problems with the tourists and had generally made them feel most welcome. From the Native team players there is also an interesting contrast of reflections. Pie Wynyard, who had gone to England on his own business and played less than a fifth of the tour games, offered only praise for Britain.

> The trip home is a dream of every footballer, and my impressions of the tour of the Native team will never be effaced from my memory. I am unable to express sufficiently the pleasures experienced. The voyage, the sights seen, the hospitality and kindness experienced in Britain are tremendous items to write about.[73]

Joe Warbrick, who although contributing little as a player was nevertheless at the heart of proceedings, offered an altogether more circumspect assessment.

> As a country England did not quite come up to my expectations, and this is a prevalent opinion of New Zealanders and perhaps is due to the fact that from infancy we read and hear of nothing else but England, and the imagination gets imbued with perhaps extravagant notions. That it is a wonderful country there are no two opinions, and if anyone doubts the fact of it being the greatest money making centre of the world, he has only to take up his stand at the numerous large stations of the railway lines throughout England and watch the streams of human beings literally pouring into the centres from every nook and corner of the country, all bent upon making money, but as a place of amusement England is, I should say, the rich man's paradise and the poor man's hades.[74]

Ultimately, after their experiences on and off the field, it is Warbrick's view which seems more adequately to capture the feelings of the team. But as they departed for Australia, the controversies of the Native tour were by no means over. Again

---

[73] Wynyard, Ibid, p.115.

[74] Warbrick, Ibid, p.111.

Scott and Eyton's pursuit of money produced frictions and disappointments, and again the conduct of the team drew the wrath of rugby officials. By the time the Native team returned to New Zealand, their legacy had been fairly much established.

CHAPTER SIX

Much More Than a Circus: Fluctuating Fortunes and New Perspectives.

If the six months in Britain has rightly come to be the major focus of the Native tour, it is by no means the entirety of the story. From the last British match against Southern Counties, the team were to endure another five months and almost forty fixtures in Australia and New Zealand before finally disbanding at Auckland on 24 August 1889. And inevitably this period contained its share of controversy. In Brisbane the team were again beset by accusations of professionalism and disreputable playing conduct which resulted in player suspensions, unwanted publicity and a formal enquiry. There was also a continuation of tensions between the tour promoters and the New Zealand provincial rugby union's over money and control of match arrangements. But above all these final controversies were to cause much greater and lasting damage than the actual issues involved. For it was the New Zealand rugby hierarchy and, in part, the press, but not the Native team themselves, who exercised most control over the legacy of the tour. At tour's end the team could point to a superb playing record and widespread vindication for most of their actions. Yet their perceived lack of respectability in critical areas, reinforced by events late in the tour, ensured that all of this counted for little and that the collective

memory of the rugby world would see the Native team as something akin to a sporting circus. It is the final task of this account to assess the validity of this verdict.

May 24-v. Melbourne R.F.C.	At Melbourne	Won 13 to 6
May 31-v. Navy Team XVIII	At Melbourne	Won 13 to 6
June 11-v. Victoria	At Melbourne	Won 19-0
June 15-v. New South Wales	At Sydney	Won 12 to 9
June 17-v. University of Syd'y	At Sydney	Won 17 to 7
June 19-v. Parramatta XVIII	At Sydney	Won 21 to 0
June 22-v. New South Wales	At Sydney	Won 16 to 12
June 25-v. Arfoma R.F.C.	At Sydney	Won 27 to 3
June 28-v. Permanent Artillery XVIII	At Sydney	Won 32 to 10
July 15-v. Queensland	At Brisbane	Won 22 to 0
July 17-v. Toowoomba XVI	At Toowoomba	Won 16 to 0
July 19-v. Ipswitch	At Ipswitch	Won 17 to 5
July 22-v. Queensland	At Brisbane	Won 11 to 7
July 24-v. Toowoomba XVII	At Toowoomba	Won 19 to 0

In all respects the Australian tour is a testimony to the motives of Scott and Eyton as speculators. The standard of rugby, with the exception of some matches in New South Wales and the representative fixtures in Queensland, was not high. Indeed, a number of minor matches against XVIII's and those under Victorian and Association rules, both codes with which the Native team were unpracticed and unfamiliar, were little more than exhibitions. Their purpose was simply to draw gate

money. Again, though, it seems that Scott overestimated both his market and the drawing power of the team.

As early as November, when the injury toll was at its severest, a number of leading players had vowed that they would not undertake the Australian section of the tour. A letter to the football columnist of *The Press*, received after the team arrived in Australia, declared them tired of football and holding little enthusiasm for the Victorian game.[1] In the end, however, the threat did not amount to anything. Four players - Gage, Ihimaira, Webster and Karauria - did return directly to New Zealand, but in all cases valid reasons can be found. In an interview shortly after his arrival at Lyttelton in May 1889, Gage said that he was returning on account of a sick relative, and his subsequent appearance in five matches after the rest of the team returned to New Zealand leaves little room to suspect animosity.[2] For the other three players it was a matter of injury or illness and none of them reappeared in New Zealand. Ihimaira, described by Eyton as constantly unfit, played only fourteen matches in Britain and was not surprisingly invalided home.[3] Karauria, who missed only five matches during the first four months in Britain, thereafter suffered constant illness and was to die of Tuberculosis within months of his return to New Zealand.[4] The position of Webster can be gauged from his appearance in 35 of the first 37 tour matches and only three thereafter.[5]

---

1 *The Press*, 3 June 1889, p.2.
2 Ibid, 24 May 1889, p.5.
3 Eyton, Rugby Football, p.12.
4 Ibid, p.14
5 See Appendix 3.

The motives of three other players - McCausland, Anderson and Stewart - who left the team following its matches in Victoria, are less certain. It is possible that McCausland had employment obligations, having only taken a years leave from his bank job in Auckland.[6] Of Anderson and Stewart nothing is recorded other than that they reappeared for the Native team in its last match against Auckland on 24 August. But the real consequence of these departures, especially those of the durable Gage and McCausland, was to reduce considerably playing strength and thus place a greater burden on those who remained. When the party left Melbourne in mid June 1889, it numbered only nineteen players.[7]

The warm climate of Australia and the growing prosperity of her colonies provided an ideal basis for the expansion of a variety of leisure activities. Football among these had undoubtedly flourished in its various folk forms prior to 1850. But it was only with the codification of a specifically Victorian game, by Thomas Wills and others in the late 1850s, that the pattern of rivalries and lucrative spectator interest was set. In New South Wales and Queensland rugby came to dominate and a high level of interest surrounded the inter-colonial fixture after its first staging in 1882.[8] That Scott appreciated the potential of these developments, and particularly those in Victoria, is evident from his engagement of Jack Lawlor as a coach prior to departure from Melbourne in 1888. Yet, as both Eyton and Ellison record, the venture was a

---

6 *Athletic News*, 23 October 1888, p.1.

7 Eyton, Rugby Football, p.84.

8 P.A. Horton, " A History of Rugby Union Football in Queensland, 1882-1891 ", unpub. PhD thesis, University of Queensland 1989, passim.

failure in most respects. In the first instance, the hectic schedule in Britain had left Lawlor with absolutely no opportunity to perform his task.[9] Consequently the team which took the field for the first Victorian encounter against Maryborough on 15 May 1889 possessed little knowledge of the rules of the game or its basic skills and was comprehensively beaten.[10] As one reporter described proceedings during another substantial loss to Carlton;

> The play, though at times laughable, was not exciting, and Carlton were able to take matters easily right through. Mr Traitt, who was field umpire, made the matter as easy as possible for the Maoris by considerably shutting his eyes to their errors which, however, less frequent than might have been supposed.[11]

According to Ellison, the major difficulty facing the Native team, aside from misinterpreting rules, was a lack of specialist back players to compete with Australian teams in such an open game. Under these circumstances the team won less than half of their Victorian rules matches and did not attract a great deal of paying spectator interest.[12] But if nothing else, these matches certainly added to the physical toll of the tour.

By the time the Native team reached Brisbane in mid July they were undefeated in rugby matches on Australian soil. Ironically, however, the magnitude of these successes was to count against them as a major controversy erupted following the return match against Queensland on 22 July. During the

---

[9] Eyton, Rugby Football, p.7; Ellison, The Art of Rugby Football, p.72.
[10] *The Press*, 24 May 1889, p.2.
[11] Ibid, 6 June 1889, p.2.
[12] Ellison, The Art of Rugby Football, p.72.

first half of the match a number of observers were considerably surprised by the poor play of the visitors, and only exceptional efforts by William Warbrick at full-back ensured that the scores remained close. As the *Brisbane Courier* put it,

> Some of the Maoris seemed scarcely upto form in the early part of the game, but towards the end they all appeared to work exceedingly well ... . The best man of the team, W. Warbrick, upheld his reputation well.[13]

Eventually the Native team regained its composure to win 11-7, but the damage had already been done. There were allegations that several members of the team had been bribed to "throw" the game and thus enable others to secure the long odds being offered by local bookmakers for a Queensland win. According to one Brisbane report, the full-back (presumably William Warbrick) was offered £50 if " he would let the local men go past him occasionally ".[14] Another source suggested that the transformation in play had only occurred after very strong words from Joe Warbrick at half-time and his threat to reveal the names of players and bookmakers involved. Still another went so far as to say that the allegations had come directly from the team management, although this seems unlikely in view of what followed.[15] Beyond this there are no other details as to the allegations or the terms involved. The practical outcome, however, was the suspension by Scott and Eyton of four players - Goldsmith, Keogh, Madigan and Arthur Warbrick - pending further investigation. The touring party

---

[13] Quoted in Horton, "Rugby Union Football in Queensland", p.415.
[14] *Otago Witness*, 8 August 1889, p.27.
[15] Ibid, 15 August 1889, p.26.

was thus reduced to a bare XV for its last Australian match against Toowoomba.[16]

While the Northern Rugby Union of Queensland saw no need to take any action on this matter, and no correspondence from them was ever forthcoming, the New Zealand union's took a much stronger line. When the team returned home in early August, Otago forwarded the following telegram to Eyton.

> Statements to public papers here and elsewhere re four men ... suspended for shady practices in Brisbane have never been contradicted. The Otago Rugby Football Union declines to play or sanction any match in which these men take part until a public contradiction of that statement has been made and a most ample and satisfactory explanation of the circumstances which gave rise to it is given to this Union.[17]

At an Invercargill dinner following the match against Southland on 7 August, Eyton expressed confidence that he could prove to the Otago union that there was no truth to the allegations. Indeed in a letter to that body a few days later he insisted that the four players had only been suspended to allow a proper resolution, and that a team meeting had since unanimously called for reinstatement on the grounds that serious doubts existed in the case against the players.[18]

Nothing is known of the enquiry held by the Otago union when the team reached Dunedin other than an admission by one player that he had taken a bet on the result of the England international - for a new hat! The outcome, however, was an official resolution dismissing all charges.

> That having heard all the available evidence regarding charges against certain members of the Native team, and having received an explicit denial

---

16 Ibid, 8 August 1889, p.27.

17 Ibid.

18 *The Press*, 9 August 1889, p.5; 10 August 1889, p.5.

> from the accused members, and satisfactory explanations from the management, the committee is of opinion that there are no facts before them justifying the accusations against these members of having sold the match at Brisbane on the 20th July, and that the committee regrets that the rumours which emanated from the Native team itself were not promptly contradicted by the management.[19]

Generally the decision not to proceed further seems to have been welcomed by the public and press, although not by the Southland union which felt that there was strong evidence against one player in particular. From the present distance one cannot of course make an accurate judgement, although there are several points to consider. One is to remember that this was not the first time the Native team had become involved in financial intrigues. A year earlier the departure of the team had been marked by numerous accusations of professionalism and speculation. There is also a continuity regarding two of the suspended players. During the final weeks in Britain both Keogh and Madigan were apparently in dispute with Scott over money and refused to play several matches. Furthermore, in 1891 Keogh was suspended by the Otago union on charges of professionalism and gambling.[20] But against this is a lack of any action from authorities in Queensland and their decision to stand apart from the Otago enquiry. Also, the initial suspicion of the Otago union is entirely consistent with its view of the team during the previous year, and one can thus conclude that its final decision in their favour was not arrived at lightly.

Perhaps, though, the Brisbane affair had a significance irrespective of its outcome. For in the manner that the Native team had departed amid a series of controversies over their

---

19 Ibid, 10 August 1889, p.5.

20 See Appendix one.

status and conduct, so they returned under similar circumstances a year later. Beyond the rights and wrongs of the issue the fact remained that the time they had spent in New Zealand at each end of the tour was dominated by suspicion and defensiveness from both the press and rugby officials. Moreover, although these bodies took a surprisingly low key approach to the problems which had developed in Britain, even the limited reports of the champagne excesses of team members before the Middlesex match and the protests against Roland Hill during the England international can have served only to perpetuate the prevailing mistrust. And in this environment it will soon be seen that Scott's renewed dealings with the New Zealand provincial union's did even more damage to the reputation of the team.

Aug. 7-v. Southland	At Invercargill	Won 5 to 1
Aug. 8-v. Mataura Dist. XVI	At Gore	Won 16 to 3
Aug.10-v. Otago	At Dunedin	Won 11 to 8
Aug.15-v. Hawkes Bay	At Christchurch	Won 13 to 2
Aug.17-v. Canterbury	At Christchurch	Won 15 to 0
Aug.19-v. Wairarapa	At Masterton	Won 10 to 8
Aug.20-v. Wellington	At Wellington	Won 4 to 1
Aug.24-v. Auckland	At Auckland	Lost 7 to 2

With four players under suspension and an injury to Pie Wynyard, the team was reduced to only fourteen fit players when it arrived back in New Zealand on 5 August 1889. With an injury to Harry Lee in the match against Southland, this number was further reduced and a substitute player, W. Hirst,

was pressed into service for the match at Gore. But with playing stocks restored after the Dunedin enquiry, the Native team were able to present the New Zealand public with a brand of combined rugby far removed from that of the previous year. The view after the Hawkes Bay game was particularly enthusiastic.

> It is within the bounds of possibility that no New Zealand team could successfully cope with the Maoris in their present improved form. Combination was a big feature in the game, and the wearers of the black passed with remarkable accuracy and quickness between their legs, over their shoulders, under their arms and with their feet. Their collaring was also good. In fact their play must have reminded the spectators of that fine exhibition of football we received from the English team when it was here.[21]

On the field at least they were redeeming their reputation and public interest in the tour increased rapidly. Some indication of the restored confidence and morale of the team can be drawn from a letter to *The Press* in early June. " They are unanimous in describing their New Zealand matches "soft things" and say that the English team which visited the colonies last season would not be in the same street as them ".[22]

Yet the team which reached Auckland for the last tour match on 24 August did not possess anything like the strength necessary to sustain such claims. Lee had departed with injury after the Southland match, Keogh remained in Dunedin and Gage and Ellison in Wellington. Nehua and Sherry Wynyard had also departed on the journey north, and it seems that Joe Warbrick was again carrying an injury - having not played since Gore.

---

21 *The Press*, 16 August 1889, p.6.
22 Ibid, 3 June 1889, p.2.

Thus, in spite of a great deal of public support and predictions generally in favour of the tourists, Auckland were able to repeat their success of the previous year and remained the only New Zealand province to have played and been undefeated by the Native team. After fourteen months, 107 rugby matches and 78 victories, this was not an accurate reflection of the tour.[23]

Off the field, a familiar pattern had also unfolded between the Native team and the provincial union's. Firstly, Southland displayed its antagonism by desiring to continue with charges over the Brisbane affair after they had been quashed. Otago, although responding positively in this respect, then offered a very low 40 percent of gate receipts against Scott's demand for sixty percent. Eventually, in acknowledging extreme public disappointment if a match was not played, the union agreed to split the gate.[24] For the match against the touring Hawkes Bay team in Christchurch the issue was one of jurisdiction. While the Hawkes Bay union declared that it would only sanction a match against the Native team if played in Napier, the team replied that as it contained all of the senior club captains and a majority of delegates to the union, the match should be recognised - as it duly was.[25] Arrangements for the Canterbury game appear to have proceeded without incident, but those for a match with Wellington soon became rather complicated. In the first instance, Scott informed the union secretary that unless he could secure the Basin Reserve, with its obvious

---

23 Ibid, 26 August 1889, p.6.
24 Ibid, 30 May 1889, p.6.
25 Ibid, 10 August 1889, p.5; 14 August 1889, p.6; 15 August 1889, p.6.

gate potential, the Native team would not play in Wellington. In response, the union suggested it was unlikely that the City Council would agree to this request, but said that a match could be arranged for Newtown Park with the visitors receiving 75 percent of the gate. Yet it seems that not even this was acceptable to Scott. For on the morning of the match it was reported that public demand for a fixture had forced Wellington to offer all gate receipts less expenses for Newtown Park.[26] Finally, the last tour match at Auckland on 24 August was placed in jeopardy when Scott demanded 60 percent of receipts against a union offer of 50 percent. Again, however, the promoter got his way.[27]

Implicit in these negotiations is both Scott's preoccupation with money and the continuing antipathy of the rugby hierarchy. The Wellington match, especially, shows that the promoters were quite willing to use the leaver of public opinion to achieve their ends. Having apparently failed in their Victorian speculation, and drawn only a meagre return from Britain, New Zealand represented the last opportunity to secure a worthwhile profit. Whether this transpired is not known. By contrast, the general offer from the union's of a 50 percent gate, and especially Otago's proposed 40 percent, represented not only considerably less than the 75 percent which had become standard for the tour of Britain, but also less than what had been offered to the British team in 1888 or to the Native team on their first tour of New Zealand - both figures in the vicinity of 60 percent. While one can understand

---

26 Ibid, 26 July 1889, p.6; 9 August 1889, p.5; 20 August 1889, p.6.
27 Ibid, 30 May 1889, p.6; 27 July 1889, p.5.

the desire of the union's to secure their own advantage from what was becoming a very popular public spectacle, it is nevertheless a fair indication of their collective attitude that they pursued arrangements lower than established precedent.

A further measure of the feeling of the union's at the end of the tour can be taken from their response to several proposals which emerged for another tour of Britain within the near future. As early as October 1888 a Mr Pratt of Christchurch had raised the possibility of taking a second Maori team to Britain and North America. However, his plans, which were said to involve members of the Taiaroa and Ellison families, soon collapsed.[28] In April 1889 when private interests in Wellington announced their intention to assemble a fully representative New Zealand team,[29] the response was swift. The Otago union immediately condemned the idea on the grounds that frequent touring would encourage professionalism and that any subsequent tour must be under the authority of the provincial union's.[30] Within days Nelson and Auckland followed suit. Canterbury, although happy with the idea of a tour, stuck firmly to the demand for union control.[31] Against this response the plan lapsed and it was to be four years before another team left New Zealand - on a tour to Australia in 1893 under the auspices of the newly formed New Zealand Rugby Football Union.

From this reaction it is quite apparent that the formation of the national body in 1892 owed a good deal to the problems

---

28 *The New Zealand Referee*, 19 October 1888, p.259; 22 November 1888, p.8.
29 *The Press*, 15 January 1889, p.5; 27 April 1889, p.6.
30 Ibid, 15 April 1889, p.6.
31 Ibid, 2 June 1889, p.6; 3 June 1889; pp.5-6.

Harry Lee, Tom Ellison, Pie Wynyard - Wellington Representative Team 1892.

Tabby Wynyard

posed by the Native team. As the game expanded with increasing inter-provincial and international contacts it was essential to extend the earlier standardisation of playing methods to a common policy which bound all areas of the game. To this end much of the early legislation of the New Zealand union was concerned with on and off field discipline, jurisdiction and penalties for transgression. Only those who conformed to the new standard would be allowed to convey the New Zealand game abroad.

It is to this set of views, and their English complement, that one must eventually return when assessing the very minor position which the Native tour has assumed in both rugby lore and the wider course of New Zealand history. For the moment, though, it is essential to place the tour in the context of those that followed - namely the 1905 and 1924 All Black teams to Britain. Such a comparison, as we shall see, makes the subsequent historical obscurity of the Native team very difficult to understand or justify.

Attempting to make straightforward qualitative judgements between teams from different periods is, almost without exception, a pointless exercise. Rather the sensible question is one concerning the extent to which a particular combination was able to dominate the fully representative playing standard of their period under the circumstances in which they played. Arthur Swan, perhaps New Zealand's greatest rugby historian, has suggested that fewer than half of the games played by the Native team in Britain could be designated first-class by later

standards. Among these he includes the international matches, all of the English county sides and the leading Welsh clubs.[32]

But if Swan's distinction is technically true, it is also deceptive in that supposedly representative county sides such as Northamptonshire, Cumberland County and Devonshire were in no way as strong as many of the leading northern clubs who were not deemed worthy of first-class status. Indeed the matter of the northern clubs is crucial to this comparison in that it is only the Native team, and not the two All Black teams, who can claim to have encountered the full weight of British rugby during their period. For the schism of the 1890s wrought changes in British rugby which left the union game as but a shadow of its former self during the first quarter of the twentieth century. In 1893 the Rugby Football Union could muster 481 clubs including more than 150 in Yorkshire and a large number in Lancashire. By 1903 the emergence of the Northern Union had reduced the number of clubs by half to 244 and the numerical strength was not regained until 1925. At its 1898 Annual General Meeting the Lancashire County Union could muster only eight affiliated clubs and Yorkshire only fourteen in 1901. Furthermore, after winning seven of the first eight county championships upto 1895, Yorkshire did not regain the title until 1926 and Lancashire only in 1935.[33] As to England, who had dominated international competition in the

---

[32] Swan, in Reed, 100 Years of Rugby, pp.55-58.

[33] Gate, Rugby League, p.29; G. Williams in Mason, Sport in Britain, pp.313-14.

1870s and 1880s, they failed to win a triple crown - victory over Ireland, Scotland and Wales - between 1892 and 1910.[34]

From these figures it is quite evident that the opposition encountered, by the 1905 All Blacks in particular, can hardly have been representative of English rugby. In 1888-89 the Native team contested at least 40 of their 74 British matches against clubs who subsequently joined the Northern Union or against representative teams drawn from such clubs. Included in this were nineteen of the 22 clubs involved in the original 1895 breakaway.[35] In addition, the England team which took the field at Blackheath contained eight Yorkshire and two Lancashire players.[36] By contrast, the 32 British matches of the 1905 All Blacks included only four against northern clubs in which they scored 150 points while conceding only three - and included a 40-0 defeat of Yorkshire.[37] The England team which succumbed 15-0 at Crystal Palace contained only two northern players - both from Durham City.[38] Indeed The *Field* put matters in perspective at the end of the tour when it suggested that the success of the All Blacks, in matches which were all deemed first-class, was as much due to their own skill as to the lack of combination from the many "scratch" teams fielded against them. Only the Welsh had been a well drilled combination and "homogeneous" in their approach.[39] Yet

---

34 J. Griffith, The Book of English International Rugby, London 1982, pp.436-40. From 1871 to 1891, England won 31, drew eight and lost four international matches. From 1892 to 1910 they won eighteen, drew four and lost 36.

35 Figures derived from Gate, Rugby League, passim.

36 Griffith, English International Rugby, p.51.

37 Chester & McMillan, Encyclopedia, p.380.

38 Griffith, English International Rugby, p.102.

39 *The Field*, 23 December 1905, pp.1071-2.

one might even suggest that Welsh rugby, which claimed a famous international victory at Cardiff, was also much weaker than previously due to Northern Union defections. Indeed, the first international fixtures under the new code were between teams designated "England" and "Wales".[40]

For the tour of the 1924 "Invincibles" a similar, if less extreme pattern emerges. Of the 28 matches in Britain only five were against northern teams, and of these Lancashire and Northumberland came closest in losing to the All Blacks by 23 point margins.[41] In spite of winning the County Championship in the following season, Yorkshire made no contribution to the England team - the single northern player being from Liverpool.[42]

But even allowing for comparatively weaker opposition, one cannot gloss over the fact that whereas the Native team lost twenty matches in Britain, the two All Black teams suffered only one reverse between them. Yet the circumstances in which they achieved these results were also markedly better. At 32 and 28 matches respectively, neither of the All Black tours approached even half the length of the Native team itinerary in Britain - to say nothing of the tour as a whole. In 1905 the 32 matches were spread over 109 days - or an average of approximately one every 3.5 days. In 1924 the 28 matches occupied 112 days - or one every four.[43] For the

---

40 Gate, Rugby League, passim.
41 Chester & McMillan, Encyclopedia, p.383.
42 Griffith, English International Rugby, p.145.
43 Figures derived from Chester & McMillan, Encyclopedia, pp.380,383.

Native team the British figure is a much more hectic one match every 2.3 days.[44]

Even without these comparisons it is apparent that both the Native team and certain of their contemporaries were quite aware of the magnitude of their performance. George Williams, for one, was pessimistic as to the prospects for future touring teams to Britain.

> I have been so often asked whether (in my opinion) a strictly speaking representative team of New Zealand could sally forth on such a tour as that of the Native team and return with higher honours? I answer emphatically no. It might be, if limited to 30 or 40 matches, they would put down Yorkshire, All-England, Middlesex and such teams as inflicted the greatest defeats upon us, but this is even then improbable.[45]

Joe Warbrick reinforced this with a scathing reference to the performance of the 1893 New Zealand team in Australia.

> What may I ask would be the fate of the last New Zealand team that journeyed to Australia if they had been asked to play 3 matches a week in the same time (6 months) when with 23 and a reinforcement of four more they attributed their defeat at the end of a fortnight to staleness .... I certainly do not think they would defeat an All-England team. A Rep. team that can be defeated by New South Wales twenty-five points to three would certainly have small hopes of coping successfully against the flower of English football. Neither do I think that any New Zealand team would be equal to the best 15 of the Native team when they returned in 1889, all being fit and well.[46]

From the management there were contradictory views. In an interview following the last match in Britain, Scott, whose basis for any assessment always lay beyond the field, declared that prospects for a future tour were excellent. " We have much better talent than was included in the present combination and if able to obtain anything like a

---

[44] See Appendix 2.

[45] Williams in Eyton, Rugby Football, pp.91-2.

[46] Warbrick, Ibid, p.112.

representative side, could doubtless secure a still better record ".[47] Eyton was altogether more laudatory in his assessment of the team. " Eventually ... the ugly duckling throve exceedingly and became - I have no hesitation in saying - the best and handsomest exponents (as a touring team) of rugby football in any part of the world ".[48]

If not in such grand terms, Eyton's basic tenet was certainly echoed by leading rugby observers of the period. George Dixon, who went on to manage the 1905 All Blacks, readily acknowledged the scepticism which had accompanied the departure of the Native team, and suggested that at this time they were little better than an average provincial side. By the end of the tour, however, they had developed a combination and record to surprise even their most sanguine supporters.[49] Irwin Hunter, a leading Otago player of the 1880s and later a writer on the game, readily disputed any suggestion that the Native team was not of the highest standard.

> When the Maoris came back at their full strength no team in New Zealand could have looked them in the face .... The Maori team was not strong when it went away, but what made that team was the picking up of Keogh and the great capacity for observation and imitation possessed by the Maoris .... I think the football they showed was the best we have ever seen in this country.[50]

Finally, at the beginning of the 1905 tour, *The Field* offered a direct and notable comparison. " They are a fine body of men, though not possessed of the phenomenal physique of the native

---

47 *Sporting Life*, 28 March 1889, p.4.
48 Eyton, Rugby Football, p.6.
49 Dixon, The Triumphant Tour, p.10.
50 Hunter, New Zealand Rugby Football, p.7.

Maori players who made an English tour some sixteen years ago ". [51]

Why then has the Native team not assumed its rightful high place in the history of New Zealand sport? Why did it fail as a focal point for the development of New Zealand rugby during such a critical period at the end of the nineteenth century? and what has been its fate in more recent times? To answer these questions one does not have to scratch far below the surface of the tour.

At all levels the Native tour was dominated by conflicts of interest and ideals. Yet it had not begun with an automatic assumption of hostility against either the tour or its original Maori composition. Other than standard guarantees as to amateur status, the Rugby Football Union had no doubts about extending patronage to Warbrick's proposal in early 1888. The New Zealand provincial union's, both in their agreement to play matches and to support the tour financially with a percentage of gate receipts, quickly followed suit. Moreover, along with the sporting press they maintained a particularly ambiguous stance towards Maori players - appearing to decline any right of jurisdiction over the team until European players were added. Indeed beyond an elite concern with the role of sport in cementing imperial control, and an equally narrow interest in the physical characteristics of the Native team, issues of race and racial quality did not figure at any point during the tour.

But from the moment the team took the field, the initial encouragement of the provinces was sorely tested. The

---

51 *The Field*, 23 September 1905, p.561.

speculative aspect of the tour, and its implication that the game was being used for personal profit, did not sit entirely easily in established quarters. Nor did the addition of European players. Most union's interpreted this as a challenge to their jurisdiction. Of greater distress, however, was the spectre of professionalism at a time when the Rugby Football Union was moving to protect the game's strict amateur ethos. Even if there was finally no conclusive evidence to link the Native team with player payments, the suspicion remained and although the provincial union's could ultimately see no proper grounds to prevent the tour, nor did they have any reason to actively encourage it. Similarly, allegations of speculation and professionalism did not sit well with elements of the sporting press who feared that the wrong impression of New Zealand rugby and of the character of the colony as a whole would be created in Britain.

After favourable early responses, and some suggestion that the Native tour invoked higher ideals in an imperial context, an identical pattern to that of New Zealand was to unfold in Britain. Although accusations of professionalism did not again surface, Scott and Eyton's financial objectives and the on field conduct of the team created much antagonism in official circles and nearly caused a premature end to the tour after the England international. In the end it did not matter that the "crimes" of the Native team were no different from those of players in the north of England and Wales, or that these localities found little or no fault with the tourists. For within seven years they too were to split with the Rugby Football Union over points such as playing format, playing methods and

"broken-time" payments. The "gentlemanly" controlling body of rugby stood its ground in adhering to a code of conduct and sporting purpose derived from public school ideals. In this environment the Native team emerged as an easy scapegoat for prevailing north/south tensions in British rugby. Indeed the depth of feeling might be drawn from the fact that it was seventeen years before another team from New Zealand toured Britain - the "Original" All Blacks of 1905. As W.J.T. Collins wrote in his Rugby Recollections, " It is probable that the long interval between the visit of the Maoris in 1888-89 and the All Blacks in 1905 was partly due to the suspicion that there were malpractices on the part of the Maoris, as there were by lots of English and Welsh clubs on tour ".[52] Furthermore, the nineteen year gap before the next All Black tour in 1924 does not compare favourably with that between the first two Springbok tours in 1906-7 and 1912-13.[53]

If it is surprising that the New Zealand press and provincial union's had little to say about events in Britain, the return of the Native team in August 1889 proved that little had changed. While the Brisbane affair again produced no conclusive evidence against them, it acted, in combination with Scott's "money-grabbing" exploits, to perpetuate the feeling of the previous year. In spite of public admiration for the play of the team, their last contacts in an official context were unfavourable.

It can be seen, though, that the union stance was as unrepresentative and hypocritical as that held in Britain. On

---

[52] W.J.T Collins, Rugby Recollections, Newport 1948, p.126.
[53] Ibid, pp.137-43.

the one hand, in a desire to boost the New Zealand game, the provincial union's had readily stood out against the Rugby Football Union and welcomed a privately organised and speculative British tour. Moreover it was a venture subject to allegations of professionalism with a much stronger foundation than those levelled at the Native team. To criticise one and not the other reveals a very selective interpretation of control and interest that was obviously not based on the broader ideals and objectives of the game. Further, at all levels and in all periods of New Zealand rugby there is ample evidence of a significant division between the public image claimed by administrators and the private reality pursued by players. Chris Laidlaw, among others, reminds us that rough play, rougher language and what can euphemistically be termed "high spirited" off-field behaviour has always been a prominent factor in New Zealand rugby. Without making any value judgement as to the propriety or otherwise of such activities, one can nevertheless conclude that the Native team were by no means unique in their behaviour and thus no more deserving of criticism than many others both past and present. The problem was that on the field they chose to openly question what they regarded as unjust, and off it they failed to contain themselves within the facade that the establishment demanded. The role model that New Zealand rugby should have had from its first touring team to Britain was instead trivialised by a self interested double-standard based on the pursuit of power by the provincial union's.

Under these circumstances the Native tour was hardly likely to be embraced in any wider context. That they were not a

fully representative colonial selection cannot be denied. Indeed the fact that they were Maori may have counted against their gaining appeal among a predominantly European population. Yet a simple comparison with the 1905 All Blacks reveals no civic receptions for the team and nothing to compare with the interest and support of Premier Richard Seddon. Consequently, although the Native team had more than adequately proved that they were physically capable of holding their own with the "Mother Country", and thus implying that all colonial stock was up to standard, this did not translate into even a tentative colonial affirmation or sense of emergent nationhood being associated with their endeavours.

Rather it seems that the exact opposite has occurred in that much rugby writing of recent times has treated the Native team less than seriously. Admittedly there has always been a problem with a lack of detail beyond Eyton's rather selective account of the tour. But the tendency with what information there is has been to highlight only the sensational aspects of the tour - the Middlesex champagne incident, the England international walk-off, the Brisbane affair and various anecdotes of dubious accuracy. Among others, stories persist that the back-line appeared in overcoats for one match at Carlisle, that many of the team played in bare feet throughout a British winter and even that the spirit of the tour had been such that the team were not happy to disband after their final match at Auckland.[54] The real successes, such as the

---

[54] See for example D. Guiney, The Dunlop Book of Rugby Union, London 1974; W. McCarthy, Haka: The Maori Rugby Story; K. Quinn, The Encyclopedia of World Rugby, Whitianga 1991, pp.190-91. W.M. Reyburn, A History of Rugby; G. Slatter, On the Ball; J. Sinclair, "New Zealand Rugby Museum Newsletter". None

international victory against Ireland and numerous others against strong opposition, are subsumed by tones which lend themselves more to the account of an exotic barn-storming circus than a committed and talented touring team.

The massive itinerary, which perhaps did more than anything else to shape the fortunes of the tour, is frequently presented in such terms of disbelief as to cast doubts on its quality or significance. Moreover there has been little effort to probe beyond the surface to assess such things as the impact of the tour on the players or the rights and wrongs of the dispute with the Rugby Football Union. While the controversial Deans try against Wales in 1905 has become part of rugby folklore on both sides of the world, few, if any, are aware of the basis of the ongoing controversy which dogged the Native team before and after the England international. Instead an emphasis on indiscretions and the unusual has fostered an impression that it was the Native team, and not their opponents, who were at fault - that they were somewhat disreputable, unrepresentative and out of step with convention. By these accounts, their place in rugby history is only as a minor curiosity.

---

of the Carlisle match reports make any mention of overcoats and the matter of bare foot play was refuted by the English press after the opening match against Surrey.

CONCLUSION

The dangers in drawing strong conclusions from the experiences of a single, sparsely documented rugby team are obvious. Yet the enduring value of the Native tour is that it offers enough continuities to suggest that qualifications need to be made in future approaches to aspects of two sometimes related areas - general attitudes to the presence and significance of non-white people in Britain during the nineteenth century, and the development of organised sport during the same period. In particular, caution must prevail as to the emphasis one places on well documented elitist ideals which connected sport with ideas of social and racial control, imperial solidarity and individual discipline. One must wonder whether these interpretations were at all relevant to, or embraced by, the majority of those who increasingly devoted their leisure time to organised sport, and whether they were in fact pursued with vigour among the elites themselves.

On the matter of the significance of race as an issue during the Native tour, several restrictions apply. Firstly, one must resist any temptation to see the tour as an aspect of specifically Maori history. Very limited biographical details

concerning all but a few players, and a complete absence of any writing on the tour from its Maori members, does not permit one to assemble any picture of tribal affiliations or considerations arising from them. Indeed all indications are that the collective emphasis of the team was distinctly European. With at least two thirds of the players being of a European father and Maori mother, and a high proportion of them obtaining a better than average European education, they can not in any respect be regarded as representative of Maori people during the late nineteenth century.

Even when the Native team promoted itself as being Maori to satisfy the speculative objectives of the tour, especially by the performance of the Haka prior to matches, this designation did not survive the test of public opinion. Responses to the team in New Zealand and Britain provide a valuable check to popular conventions that European attitudes to non-white people during the nineteenth century were entirely in a pattern of patronising curiosity or racist hostility. Reinforced by a comparison with the 1868 Aboriginal cricket tour of Britain, one finds but a single racist incident for both tours and only a short-lived and narrow interest in the physical characteristics and behaviour of the teams from the London press. Beyond this there is no sign of the rhetoric of "scientific racism" and one is confronted by a simple lack of reference to race issues from the majority of the British press.

The problem, then, is one of the extent to which an argument can properly be sustained based on omissions. Strictly speaking, the fact that the press, especially in the

predominantly working class north of England, did not dwell on the composition of the Native team, can not be taken as an active expression of views. Yet bearing in mind that these sources, over forty of which were consulted for this thesis, provided the majority of coverage for the British leg of the tour, the contrast of emphasis with London suggests that a quite different set of priorities existed. Theirs was an essentially immediate and localised outlook divorced from the exigencies of imperial policy and the higher ideals that some associated with the interaction of different peoples within the British Empire. In Yorkshire and Lancashire, especially, the Native team was taken far more at face value and found to be a straightforward sports team possessed of a general philosophy which posed significantly less tensions than that held by many from the public school and university background of southern England.

A similar manifestation of this north/south dichotomy is also apparent in terms of the relationship between sport and imperialism and in attitudes to the conduct of players both on and off the field. The arrival of the Native team in Britain, significant as the first such visit from New Zealand, was greeted by *The Times* and its ilk in terms which made clear that the tour was another vital component in a process whereby the encouragement of common sporting customs within the colonies, involving both "native" peoples and colonists, was integral to the maintenance of continuity within the British Empire. Explicit comparisons were drawn with India, Australia and South Africa. Again, though, these sentiments are confined to London and completely lacking in

the wider body of "provincial" press opinion. That a significant number of sources fail even to record the results of international matches on the Native tour, is but one indication of their local focus.

Thus a constraint emerges from the tour which needs to be addressed with much greater clarity than has previously been the case. The historian seeking to provide an account of the link between sport and the quest for imperial solidarity during the nineteenth and early twentieth centuries must be clear that the views expressed were those of an interested and informed elite based around a public school and university tradition. There is as yet no reliable means of gauging the opinions of those outside this narrow fold, and particularly the working classes. And yet it was the rise of the working classes in terms of playing strength, a vast paying spectatorship and on field domination which did more than anything to alter the face of British sport in the decades after the elites had organised and codified it. In rugby, soccer and cricket the county and club teams of Yorkshire, and to a lesser extent Lancashire, set new standards of excellence and competitiveness in Britain from the 1880s onwards. A dearth of primary material, of course, makes it extremely naive to contemplate "ground level" opinions in the major political or military developments of world history. Indeed, there is an obvious case to question their real influence in these areas. But the numerical balance and influence demands that at least an acknowledgement of this element is essential to the writing of sports history. The purpose is not to dismiss elite

interpretations, but simply to give them a more realistic context.

Nowhere is this context more apparent than in a discussion of contrasting attitudes to sportsmanship. While the Native team met hostility from both the London press and the Rugby Football Union for their apparently rough playing methods and confrontational approach to referees, this reaction was not shared by the majority of their opposition. Indeed many in the north were careful to draw distinctions between hard and rough play in praising the competitiveness of the tourists. Conversely, there are hints from the tour, and especially the events of the international match against England, were themselves prone to the very indiscretions they outwardly opposed. Hence one is reminded that care needs to be taken when exploring the pervasiveness of the public school ideal of on field sporting conduct and the broader principles of the amateur ethos. Clearly they were not regarded as particularly relevant or applicable to the majority of British players, and within seven years of the Native tour rugby was to split largely along north/south class lines. This also highlights the problem of referring to a "civilising process" in nineteenth century sport. While on must acknowledge a vast shift from untamed folk games to formal codification and ruling bodies, the pattern beyond this point is by no means clearcut. There remained a serious tension between those who followed the law and those who followed the spirit of games, or perhaps more correctly, between those who sought only to win and those who saw a value in merely participating.

That the colonial visitors came to identify with the recalcitrants in this division, raises doubts as to the extent to which the public school old boys who took the basic rules of games to the frontiers of Empire in India, Australia, New Zealand and elsewhere, were able to reinforce this with their accompanying ethos. The attitudes of leading Native team members, such as Tom Ellison, Pat Keogh and Joe Warbrick, bore little similarity to those of Roland Hill of the Rugby Football Union or even George Sale - the Rugby old boy who did much to establish the game in Otago. The diverse class origins of the young New Zealand population, the consequently more egalitarian nature of the society as a whole, and the rigorous pioneering environment dictated an approach to rugby which emphasised practical physical values and the fostering of new identities through competitiveness. Further, in spite of early concerns as to the picture of the colony that the Native team would create at Home, the New Zealand press and provincial rugby union's failed to follow through with any reaction to the various "indiscretions" and controversies of the British tour. It seems that once the team had departed colonial shores, their importance quickly declined - leaving one to wonder who in the colony really was committed to claiming an important role for sport in binding the Empire.

With very little having been done to examine other nineteenth century sports tours in more than chronological and statistical terms, it is difficult, if not dangerous, to generalise. It may be that the experiences of the New Zealand Native team are unique. It is more likely, however, that similar patterns are to be found under the surface of responses to Australian or Indian

cricket teams or Canadian soccer teams in Britain. Historians of the development of nineteenth century sport must not be lulled into creating inflated models based on the well documented expressions of an interested elite. While these must continue to be unearthed and analysed as valuable in their own right, it must always be remembered that their context, in Britain and New Zealand at least, was one bounded on all sides by a much larger group - miners, labourers, factory workers and many more - who took to the newly organised games, claimed supremacy on the field and gradually established the competitive and "professional" dimensions which have come to dominate their modern forms. These were the sorts of people who empathised with the Native team in its struggles against the hypocrisy and selective self interest of rugby officialdom. Above all, their existence and attitude proves that far from being a disreputable blot on the landscape of sport in New Zealand and Britain, the tour has a comfortable niche within a powerful, if largely unsung, majority. Moreover, one must not forget that in its time the Native team was treated with the greatest seriousness by friends and enemies alike. That we may now find some of the reactions to the team both quaint and disproportionate, and their exploits near enough to physically impossible, is testimony to the passage of time and changing expectations. It does not entitle us to use hindsight as a tool for making value judgements.

APPENDIX ONE

The Players.

Nowhere is the sparsity of detail concerning the Native tour more apparent than in attempting to assemble a portrait of its players. Eyton offers little of substance in this area, even failing to provide full names in many cases, and the fact that a number of the team played no representative rugby beyond the tour did much to ensure their subsequent obscurity. One is also confronted by a generally erratic pattern of birth and death registrations for Maori people during the late nineteenth century, and by the departure of a number of the team to Australia during the 1890s.

ANDERSON, W. (? -c1893) Forward.

A number of sources mention that Anderson was also known as Keri Keri, and he may therefore be the W. Keri Keri on the Te Aute college role in 1882-83. Selected for the tour from the Hokianga club, he played at least 48 matches in Britain and was described by Eyton as " the hardest grafter in the team; always on the ball and did a tremendous lot of useful work, quiet and unassuming ". Returning to New Zealand before the end of the Australian tour, Anderson played no other

representative rugby and died in the Hokianga area shortly before Eyton wrote his tour book in 1894.[1]

ELLIOT, William (1867-1958) Half-back.

Elliot was an Auckland representative in twenty matches from 1887 to 1896 - including several as captain. One of the five European players in the Native team, he appeared at least 63 times in Britain and emerged as one of the leading players of the tour. Selected for Tom Ellison's 1893 New Zealand team to Australia, Elliot was subsequently unable to tour. Although he worked for a time in the New Zealand Railways workshop at Wanganui, the majority of his life seems to have been spent in Auckland. Elliot was the last survivor of the Native team - outliving Dick Taiaroa by almost four years.[2]

ELLISON, Thomas Rangiwahia (1867-1904) Forward.

Both on and off the field Ellison's life was one of considerable achievement. Born at Otakou on the Otago peninsula, he was educated at the Otakou Native School and Te Aute College. A Wellington representative on 23 occasions between 1885 and 1892, Ellison ended his rugby career as captain of the New Zealand team to Australia in 1893. On the Native tour he played at least 58 matches in Britain and 25 in Australia and New Zealand, winning high praise from Eyton for his performances. " [As] a forward ... [he] was second to none in

---

[1] Eyton. Rugby Football, p.13; Swan, "Makers of History", 1 July 1965.

[2] Chester & McMillan, Encyclopedia, p.224; McCarthy, Haka: The Maori Rugby Story, p.16.

the Native team. His knowledge of the finer points of the game, his weight, strength and activity rendered his services invaluable ".

A provincial referee, Wellington selector and member of the management committee of the Wellington union at various times throughout the 1890s, Ellison's contribution to the foundation of the New Zealand Rugby Football Union was crucial. It was on his motion that New Zealand adopted a black uniform with a silver fern as its official playing colours. His book, The Art of Rugby Football, remains a classic work on early rugby strategy in which Ellison outlines the principles of wing-forward play and the 2-3-2 scrum formation which were to characterise New Zealand rugby until the early 1930s.

Widely believed to be the first Maori to enter the legal profession, Ellison studied law in the Wellington office of Brandon & Hislop and was admitted to the bar in 1891. He stood unsuccessfully on three occasions as a parliamentary candidate for Southern Maori and also petitioned parliament for consideration of Ngai Tahu land claims in 1901. Ellison was a cousin of Dick Taiaroa.[3]

GAGE, David Richmond (1868-1916) Threequarter.
Educated at Waiomatatini primary school, St John's and St Stephen's Native school's, Gage obtained a Makarini scholarship to Te Aute College in 1882. Making his provincial rugby debut for Wellington in 1887, he also represented

---

[3] Chester & McMillan, Encyclopedia, p.67; Eyton, Rugby Football, p.13; Swan, "Makers of History", 1 July 1965; R. Scholefield, Dictionary of New Zealand Biography, Wellington 1940, pp.230-1.

Auckland and Hawkes Bay in an extensive career lasting until 1901. Such durability was also evident on the Native tour where Gage took the field in 68 of the 74 matches in Britain and thirteen matches in New Zealand - although he did not take part in the tour of Australia owing to a sick relative. For New Zealand Gage appeared eight times between 1893 and 1896 and captained the team in his last match against Queensland.

Gage worked as a Native interpreter throughout the North Island and was later employed by the Wellington City Council. Following his death, leaving a wife and six children, the Poneke club raised a significant sum of money for a memorial stone and to support his family.[4]

GOLDSMITH, Charles (Taare Koropiti) (c1869-1893) Threequarter.

Selected for the Native team while still a student at Te Aute College, Goldsmith played only twenty matches in Britain. He was, however, good enough to make five appearances for Hawkes Bay in 1889 and 1890. He died in Gisborne Hospital.[5]

IHIMAIRA, E. ("Smiler") (? - ?) Forward.

Although one of the characters of the Native team, little can be traced of Ihimaira's life beyond it. Eyton described him as " The Don Juan of the team ... very strong but not extra fast. Was somewhat of the old "bullocking" style of player, but came off occasionally ". Selected for the Native team from Te Aute

---

[4] Chester & McMillan, Encyclopedia, p.76; Eyton, Rugby Football, p.13; Ellison, The Art of Rugby Football, p.62; *The Press*. 24 May 1889, p.5.

[5] Eyton, Rugby Football, p.12; Swan, "Makers of History", 1 July 1965. Goldsmith, death registration, 1893.

College, Ihimaira was frequently unfit or injured and made only fourteen appearances in Britain. Finishing his representative rugby career with three matches for Hawkes Bay in 1891, Ihimaira was reported to be working as a publican in Hawkes Bay in 1925.[6]

KARAURIA, Wi (? -1889) Forward.

Selected for the tour without any provincial record, Karauria soon proved his worth. Described by Eyton as " an excellent forward player [who] was generally liked ", he appeared in 42 of the first 48 British matches - including 32 in succession. Thereafter he suffered from tuberculosis, was sent back to New Zealand before the Australian tour and died shortly afterwards.[7]

KEOGH, Patrick (c1867-1940) Half-back.

The leading try scorer and star player of the Native team on the field, Keogh was seldom shy of controversy off it. One of the European players, he was born in Birmingham, England, and arrived in New Zealand about 1871. Educated at the Christian Brothers school, Dunedin, Keogh played for the Kaikorai club from 1884 and Otago from 1887. In Britain he appeared 60 times and scored 34 tries.

Long remembered as one of the brilliant backs of early Otago rugby, Keogh's career came to an abrupt end in 1891. After inept play for Kaikorai against Alhambra, he was accused of

---

[6] Eyton, Rugby Football, p.12; Swan, "Makers of History", 1 July 1965.

[7] Eyton, Rugby Football, p.15; Reed, 100 Years of Rugby, p.57; *The Press*, 24 May 1889 p.5.

having money on the result of the game. Although denying the charge, Keogh admitted taking bets during the previous season, and retired before the Otago union could hear his case. In due course the union declared him a professional and disqualified him. However, in 1895 an application for reinstatement was successful - although Keogh did not subsequently play.

Keogh worked as a brass moulder in Dunedin, but his later life was marked by mental illness and numerous convictions for drunkenness. He was reportedly given six months hard labour for assaulting his wife in 1905 and spent much of the period 1913 to 1940 in Seacliff Mental Hospital where he died of bronchial pneumonia.[8]

LEE, Harry (? - ?) Forward.

In spite of reports that Lee was seriously injured early in the 1888 season, and even that he had contracted scarlet fever, he was in Napier for the start of the tour and appeared at least 50 times in Britain. Having played once for Southland in 1887 and once for Wellington in 1889, Lee ended his representative career with three matches for the later province in 1892. Although a stalwart of the Poneke club, nothing else is known of his later life.[9]

---

[8] P. Keogh, Death Certificate, 12 March 1940; Eyton, Rugby Football, p.12; O'Hagan, The Pride of Southern Rebels, pp.52-4; Otago Rugby Football Union Minute Book, 3 June 1891, p.78; 22 April 1895, p.90; 29 April 1895, p.98; 20 May 1895, p.105.

[9] Eyton, Rugby Football, p.12; Swan, "Makers of History", 1 July 1965; *New Zealand Referee*, 20 April 1888, p.259; *Otago Witness*, 12 July 1888, p.26.

MADIGAN, Charles (1866-1896) Threequarter.

One of the European players, and an Auckland representative in nine matches from 1886 to 1890, Madigan appeared only 32 times in Britain. Although one of the fastest runners and best defensive backs in the Native team, he suffered numerous injuries - including a broken ankle against East Cumberland. Frequently described as being in bad health during the 1890s, and as " dangerously ill " in 1893, Madigan died in Auckland from lung complications.[10]

MAYNARD, Richard (c1866-1897) Forward.

Maynard was described by Eyton as a " very strong and determined forward player, one of our very best and always ready for the field ". A regular player in Auckland prior to the tour, he appeared in at least 38 matches in Britain, despite injuries, and seven times for Auckland in 1889 and 1892. Moving to a farm near Gisborne, he played twice for Poverty Bay in 1894, but died of typhoid three years later.[11]

McCAUSLAND, Edward Elsmere Montgomery (Mac) (1865-1936) Threequarter/Full-back.

Born at Sandhurst, Victoria, McCausland came to New Zealand in 1880 and was employed by the Bank of New Zealand at Auckland. Prior to the Native tour he represented Auckland four times in 1886 and 1888 and Hawkes Bay five times in 1887. As the goal-kicker and sometime captain of the Native

---

[10] Eyton, Rugby Football, p.12; Swan, "Makers of History", 1 July 1965; *New Zealand Referee*, 16 April 1893, p.28.

[11] Eyton, Rugby Football, p.14; Swan, "Makers of History", 1 July 1965; Maynard, death registration, 1897.

team, he was the leading points scorer in Britain with 151 in 63 matches.

Returning to Australia in 1890, McCausland played twice for New South Wales against Queensland in 1891, became a first-class referee and gained notoriety by sending off William McKenzie of New Zealand against New South Wales in 1893. McCausland retired as Manager of the Newtown branch of the London-Scottish bank in Sydney.[12]

NEHUA, Wiri (c1866-1943) Forward/Threequarter.

Selected for the tour while a student at Te Aute College, Nehua was regarded by Eyton as " a strong player and a good kick, but a trifle slow and was not altogether reliable in the back division ". Thus he played only eight times in Britain, and only Alf Warbrick, four matches, appeared on fewer occasions. After the tour, Nehua returned to Whakapara near Whangarei, but nothing is known of his life there.[13]

RENE, Teo (? - ?) Forward.

Rene played for Nelson against New South Wales in 1886 and Wellington in 1887. However, after appearing in six of the nine Native team matches in New Zealand, he injured his foot at Suez on the journey to Britain and did not take the field for a month. Thereafter he played 43 matches and all of those on return to New Zealand.[14]

---

[12] Eyton, Rugby Football, p.12; Swan, "Makers of History", 1 July 1965; *Athletic News*, 23 October 1888, p.1.
[13] Eyton, Rugby Football, p.13; Swan, "Makers of History", 1 July 1965.
[14] Eyton, Rugby Football, p,13; Reed, 100 Years of Rugby, pp.55-6.

STEWART, David (Heta Reweti) (c1869-1909) Forward.
One of the most popular, and heaviest, members of the Native team, Stewart appeared at least 40 times in Britain. The remainder of his representative rugby career was two matches for Auckland in 1892 and one in 1893. A major land owner and race horse owner at Thames, Stewart was a borough councillor and on the committee of the local jockey club. One of his horses won the Great Northern Derby. He died of Brights disease leaving a large family.[15]

TAIAROA, Richard (1866-1954) Forward
Brother of the famed New Zealand player Jack Taiaroa, he was born at Otakou on the Otago peninsula and attended Christchurch Boys' High School as a founder pupil. Taiaroa's 59 appearances in Britain were exceeded only by Gage, Elliot, Keogh and McCausland. The remainder of his representative career comprised two matches for Wellington in 1886 and 1887 and one for Hawkes Bay in 1889.

Originally apprenticed to a civil engineer in Wellington, Taiaroa trained as a surveyor and later took control of the family farm at Taumutu - from where he won numerous awards in Canterbury A&P shows as a cattle breeder. After service in South Africa with the mounted rifles during the Boer War, Taiaroa was a Maori representative at two coronations - those of Edward VII in 1902 and George V in 1910. Awarded the OBE

---

[15] Eyton, Rugby Football, p.13; Swan, "Makers of History", 1 July 1965; *Auckland Star*, 3 December 1909.

in 1949, Taiaroa was survived by only Elliot among Native team members.[16]

WARBRICK, Alfred (1860-1940) Forward.

The oldest of the Warbrick brothers was also the least able as a rugby player - appearing only four times in Britain and twelve times in Australia and New Zealand. Yet Alf Warbrick's achievements in other areas were considerable. Born near Rotorua, where his father Abraham Warbrick was a native interpreter, he was educated in Tauranga and Auckland and originally apprenticed as a boatbuilder. Returning to Rotorua he served as chief government guide for the thermal region for most of the period from 1886 to 1932. During this time he conducted more than 10,000 visitors through the area without a fatality - including ten successive governors or governors general and the future King George V. Alf Warbrick died at the Knox home in Auckland.[17]

WARBRICK, Arthur (c1863-1902) Forward.

Regarded by Eyton as " a most determined tackler ... [who] made the most of his weight and strength ", Art Warbrick played 46 matches in Britain. However, he had no other representative rugby beyond the tour. A ferryman at Opotiki, he was drowned in a work accident.[18]

---

16 Eyton, Rugby Football, pp.13-14; Swan, "Makers of History", 1 July 1965; R. Taiaroa, obituary, *The Press*, 10 April 1954, p.8.

17 Eyton, Rugby Football, p.11; McCarthy, Haka: The All Black Story, p.15; A. Warbrick, obituary, *New Zealand Herald*, 21 May 1940.

18 Eyton, Rugby Football, p.11; Arthur Warbrick, death registration, 1902.

WARBRICK, Frederick (c1868-1904) Half-back.
The youngest and lightest of the Warbrick brothers, he improved greatly during the Native tour, played 41 matches in Britain and developed a very effective combination with Keogh. Originally employed as a journalist for the *Bay of Plenty Times*, he shifted to Australia early in 1890. There he played for the Arfoma club and for Queensland in 1892 and 1893. He also refereed Queensland's match against New Zealand in 1893. As well as working for the Queensland government printer, Fred Warbrick owned the Edgewater boarding house at Woody Point, Brisbane, where he died in a boating accident.[19]

WARBRICK, Joseph Astbury (1862-1903) Threequarter.
Born in Rotorua, Joe Warbrick was a star player in the decade prior to the Native tour. After education at St Stephen's Native school, he represented Auckland teams in 1877, 1882-83, 1886 and 1894, Wellington in 1879-80, 1886 and 1888, and Hawkes Bay in 1885 and 1887. Along with Jack Taiaroa he was one of the first Maori players to represent New Zealand - on the 1884 tour of Australia where he played all seven matches. Sadly, Warbrick's contribution to the Native tour was restricted by injury to only fourteen matches in Britain and seven matches in Britain and Australia.

Apparently a government employee after leaving school, Warbrick later farmed near Tauranga. He was a member of the Whakatane County Council and first chairman of the Rangitikei

---

[19] Eyton, Rugby Football, p.10; Swan, "Makers of History", 8 July 1965; McCarthy, Haka: The All Black Story, p.15; Warbrick family information, in possession of Rugby Museum of New Zealand, Palmerston North.

drainage board, but was killed in an eruption of the Waimungu geyser near Rotorua.[20]

WARBRICK, William (c1866- ?) Full-back.

In spite of numerous and severe injuries which restricted his appearances in Britain to only 36 matches, Billy Warbrick emerged as one of the outstanding players of the Native team. Eyton described him thus; " a dashing player, grand tackler, first-class kick, very quick at following up, and beyond being occasionally too venturesome, he left nothing to be desired in his play ".

Billy Warbrick's long representative career began with a match for Bay of Plenty Combined clubs in 1882, included two appearances for Auckland in 1886 and five more in 1890. Moving to Queensland with his brother, Fred, he represented that colony from 1891 to 1894 - including both matches against the 1893 New Zealand team. He also represented New South Wales against the 1897 New Zealand tourists. Although it is commonly held that Warbrick returned to New Zealand before his death, nothing is known of his life beyond rugby.[21]

WEBSTER, Alexander (Sandy) (c1869-1893) Forward.

Although without any representative experience, Webster made an important contribution to the first half of the tour of Britain - playing in 35 of the first 37 matches. Thereafter he was severely restricted by injury and appeared only three

---

[20] Chester & McMillan, Encyclopedia, p.206; Hunter, Rugby Football: Some Hints and Criticisms, p.10; McCarthy, Haka: The Maori Rugby Story, pp.64-5.

[21] Eyton, Rugby Football, p.10; Swan, "Makers of History" 8 July 1965; *The Bulletin*, interview, 24 July 1897.

times. Praised by Eyton for his " quiet and excellent social qualities ", Webster returned to New Zealand before the Australian tour.

Employed by a guano company near Dunedin, he died in a work accident when his feet were crushed and he was unable to obtain medical assistance.[22]

WILLIAMS, George (Bully) (1856-1925) Forward.

The oldest player in the Native team, and one of its European members, Williams was born in Auckland - the son of a British army officer. Although he did not play rugby at any level until the age of 24, he soon became a stalwart of the Poneke club, represented Wellington seven times in 1886 and 1887 and Hawkes Bay once in 1887 while stationed in the police force at Hastings. Sometimes captain of the Native team, he played at least 53 matches in Britain, but gave up rugby after the tour.

A policeman in Wellington, Hastings and Invercargill, Williams was also a member of the force which arrested the Maori prophet Te Whiti at Parihaka. Retiring to Wellington, his last public appearance was at a reception for the returning "Invincibles" in 1925.[23]

WYNYARD, George (Sherry) (1862- ?) Forward.

The oldest of the three Wynyard brothers in the Native team, Sherry Wynyard had no representative rugby experience other than the tour, but played 43 matches in Britain and twenty in

---

22 Eyton, Rugby Football, p.14; *Cambria Daily Leader*, 30 May 1893.

23 Eyton, Rugby Football, p.13; Swan, "Makers of History", 8 July 1965; G. Williams, obituary, May 1925, unknown source; G. Williams, Death Certificate, 27 April 1925.

Australia and New Zealand. Moving to Sydney in the early 1890s he played some club football and worked as a builder. Sherry Wynyard may have returned to New Zealand before 1920.

WYNYARD, Henry (Pie) (c1865-1921) Half-back.
Not an original selection, but only because he was already in Britain on his own business, Pie Wynyard joined the Native team at Newcastle in November 1888. Subsequently he only played fourteen matches in Britain and eight in Australia and New Zealand. He completed his representative career with one match for Wellington in 1891 and three in 1892. Employed for many years by the Gear Meat Company at Petone, Pie Wynyard died in Wellington.[24]

WYNYARD, William Thomas (Tabby) (c1867-1938) Threequarter.
Born and educated at Devonport, Tabby Wynyard developed as a fine all-round sportsman - representing both Auckland and Wellington at rugby, cricket and athletics - as well as being an accomplished golfer, rower, cyclist and billiards player. His representative rugby career consisted of matches for Auckland in 1887, 1889, 1895 and 1896, Wellington in 1893 and 1894 and New Zealand on the tour to Australia in 1893. For the Native team he appeared at least 52 times in Britain, and off

---

[24] Eyton, Rugby Football, p.11; Swan, "Makers of History", 8 July 1965; H. Wynyard, obituary, 11 August 1921, unknown source.

the field achieved great popularity for his singing of "On the Ball".

A public servant, Wynyard became District Manager of the New Zealand Agricultural Department in Wellington, where he died.[25]

---

[25] Eyton, Rugby Football, p.11; Chester & McMillan, Encyclopedia, p.222.J

THE MANAGEMENT

EYTON, Thomas (c1843-1925) Promoter.

The son of a Lieutenant-Commander in the Royal Navy, Eyton was born in Essex,England, and educated at the Royal Naval School Blackheath. After two years as a clerk at Trinity House, London, he emigrated to New Zealand in 1862. During the next seven years he served with the Taranaki Bushrangers and Patea Light Horse in the Anglo-Maori wars. After five years based in Wellington as a Treasury employee during the early 1870s, Eyton then went into private business as a Commission Agent at Pihea. In later life he took a considerable interest in the Anglo-Maori war veterans Association. Eyton died in Auckland.[26]

LAWLOR, Jack (? - ?) Victorian Rules Coach.

In the end, Lawlor's contribution to the Native tour was minimal. Although engaged by Scott as a Victorian Rules coach, he had no opportunity to perform this task amid the hectic British itinerary. According to Eyton he cost the promoters £200 in expenses while performing no useful purpose. And ironically, Lawlor was also added to the injury toll of the tour when he fell from a railway platform at Kirkstall after boarding the wrong train.

A player for the Ballarat and Essendon clubs in Melbourne, and occasionally for the Native team while in Victoria, Lawlor was

---

26 Chester & McMillan, Encyclopedia, p.250; T. Eyton, obituary, *Auckland Star*, 16 February 1925.

also engaged as a coach by the touring British team and came to New Zealand to assist them in May 1888.[27]

SCOTT, James (? - c1894) Manager.

A publican from Gisborne, Scott apparently performed his managerial duties very satisfactorily on tour. As George Williams put it, " I think I express the opinion of all other members of the team that we might have fared much worse in other hands ". Scott died in Nelson shortly before Eyton began his account of the tour.[28]

---

[27] Eyton, Rugby Football, pp.6-7; *Lyttelton Times*, 7 March 1889, p.2; *The Press*, 7 May 1888, p.6.

[28] Williams in Eyton, Rugby Football, pp.91-2; Eyton, Ibid, pp.5-7.

APPENDIX TWO

Match Record.

Such has been the obscurity of the Native team, even its itinerary has been a matter for some debate. The problem arises with the Australian section of the tour where matches were played under Victorian and Association rules as well as rugby. Eyton, in Rugby Football Past and Present, records that in total the team played 108 matches, won 80, drew five and lost 23. By contrast, Tom Ellison claims only 69 wins from 108 matches. Neither provides a full itinerary to support their figures. The now commonly accepted version, which is presented here, is that of Arthur Swan - 107 matches, 78 wins, six draws and 23 losses. The number of variations with Eyton suggest that Swan obtained his information from another source - perhaps an account kept by Scott. However, its accuracy can be taken from the statistics -team lists and individual scoring records - which support all but a few matches.

IN BRITISH ISLES

1888

Oct. 3-v. Surrey	At Richmond	Won 4 to 1
Oct. 6-v. Northamptonshire	At Northampton	Won 12 to 0
Oct.10-v. Kent	At Blackheath	Won 4 to 1
Oct.13-v. Moseley	At Moseley	Lost 4 to 6

Oct.18-v. Burton-on-Trent	At Burton-on-T'nt	Lost 3 to 4
Oct.20-v. Midland Counties	At Birmingham	Won 10 to 0
Oct.22-v. Middlesex	At Fletching	Lost 0 to 9
Oct.24-v. Hull	At Hull	Lost 0 to 1
Oct.27-v. Dewsbury	At Dewsbury	Won 6 to 0
Oct.31-v. Wakefield Trinity	At Wakefield	Lost 0 to 1
Nov. 3-v. Northumberland C'ty	At Newcastle	Drew 3 to 3
Nov. 5-v. Stockton-on-Tees	At Stockton	Won 6 to 1
Nov. 7-v. Tynemouth	At North Shields	Won 7 to 1
Nov.10-v. Halifax Free Wanderers	At Halifax	Lost 4 to 13
Nov.12-v. Newcastle and Dist.	At Newcastle	Won 14 to 0
Nov.14-v. Hartlepool Rovers	At Hartlepool	Won 1 to 0
Nov.17-v. Cumberland C'ty	At Maryport	Won 10 to 2
Nov.20-v. Carlisle	At Carlisle	Won 13 to 0
Nov.22-v. Hawick	At Hawick	Won 3 to 1
Nov.23-v. East Cumberland	At Carlisle	Won 12 to 0
Nov.24-v. Westmoreland C'ty	At Kendal	Won 3 to 1
Nov.26-v. Swinton	At Swinton	Lost 0 to 2
Nov.28-v. Liverpool and Dist.	At Liverpool	Won 9 to 0
Dec. 1-v. IRELAND	At Dublin	Won 13 to 4
Dec. 3-v. Trinity College	At Dublin	Drew 4 to 4
Dec. 5-v. North of Ireland	At Belfast	Won 2 to 0
Dec. 8-v. Lancashire C'ty	At Manchester	Lost 0 to 1
Dec.10-v. Batley	At Batley	Drew 5 to 5
Dec.12-v. Yorkshire C'ty	At Manningham	Won 10 to 6
Dec.15-v. Broughton Rangers	At Broughton	Won 8 to 0
Dec.17-v. Wigan	At Wigan	Won 5 to 1
Dec.19-v. Llanelly	At Llanelly	Lost 0 to 3
Dec.22-v. WALES	At Swansea	Lost 0 to 5
Dec.24-v. Swansea	At Swansea	Won 5 to 0
Dec.26-v. Newport	At Newport	Won 3 to 0
Dec.29-v. Cardiff	At Cardiff	Lost 1 to 4
Jan. 1-v. Bradford	At Bradford	Lost 1 to 4
Jan. 3-v. Leeds Parish Church	At Leeds	Won 6 to 3
Jan. 5-v. Kirkstall	At Kirkstall	Won 7 to 3
Jan. 7-v. Brighouse Rangers	At Brighouse	Won 4 to 0
Jan. 9-v. Huddersfield	At Huddersfield	Won 7 to 6
Jan.12-v. Stockport	At Stockport	Drew 3 to 3
Jan.14-v. Castleford	At Castleford	Lost 3 to 9
Jan.17-v. Warrington	At Warrington	Won 7 to 1
Jan.19-v. Yorkshire C'ty	At Wakefield	Lost 4 to 16
Jan.23-v. Spen Valley Dist	At Cleckheaton	Won 8 to 7

Jan.26-v. Somersetshire C'ty	At Wellington	Won 17 to 4
Jan.30-v. Devonshire C'ty	At Exeter	Won 12 to 0
Jan.31-v. Taunton	At Taunton	Won 8 to 0
Feb. 2-v. Gloucestershire C'ty	At Gloucester	Won 4 to 1
Feb. 4-v. Midland Counties	At Moseley	Won 6 to 1
Feb. 6-v. Blackheath Rovers	At Blackheath	Won 9 to 3
Feb. 9-v. United Services	At Portsmouth	Won 10 to 0
Feb.16-v. ENGLAND	At Blackheath	Lost 0 to 7
Feb.18-v. London Welsh	At Richmond	Won 2 to 1
Feb.19-v. Cambridge Uni.	At Cambridge	Lost 3 to 7
Feb.21-v. Oxford Uni.	At Oxford	Lost 0 to 6
Feb.23-v Manningham	At Manningham	Won 4 to 0
Feb.25-v. St John's (Leeds)	At Leeds	Won 9 to 0
Feb.27-v. Leigh	At Leigh	Lost 1 to 4
Mar. 2-v. Runcorn	At Runcorn	Won 8 to 3
Mar. 4-v. Oldham	At Oldham	Lost 0 to 6
Mar. 5-v. Halifax Free Wanderers	At Halifax	Won 6 to 0
Mar. 7-v. Barrow and Dist.	At Barrow	Lost 0 to 3
Mar. 9-v. Widnes	At Widnes	Won 8 to 1
Mar.11-v. Manchester	At Manchester	Won 7 to 1
Mar.13-v. Walkden	At Walkden	Won 6 to 1
Mar.14-v. St Helen's	At St Helen's	Won 9 to 0
Mar.16-v. Salford	At Salford	Won 7 to 1
Mar.18-v. Rochdale Hornets	At Rochdale	Won 10 to 0
Mar.20-v. York	At York	Won 4 to 3
Mar.23-v. Hull	At Hull	Drew 1 to 1
Mar.25-v. Widens	At Widnes	Won 6 to 1
Mar.27-v. Southern Counties	At Leyton	Won 3 to 1

Played 74: Won 49: Drawn 5: Lost 20:
Points for, 394: Points against, 188:

IN AUSTRALIA

1888

Aug.11-v. Melbourne	At Melbourne	Won 3 to 0
Aug.15-v. Melbourne	At Melbourne	Drew 1 to 1

1889

May 24-v. Melbourne	At Melbourne	Won 13 to 6
May 31-v. Navy Team XVIII	At Melbourne	Won 13 to 6
June 11-v. Victoria	At Melbourne	Won 19 to 0
June 15-v. New South Wales	At Sydney	Won 12 to 9
June 17-v. Uni. of Sydney	At Sydney	Won 17 to 7
June 19-v. Parramatta Club and King's School XVIII	At Sydney	Won 21 to 0
June 22-v. New South Wales	At Sydney	Won 16 to 12
June 25-v. Arfoma	At Sydney	Won 27 to 3
June 28-v. Permanent Artillery XVIII	At Sydney	Won 32 to 10
July 15-v. Queensland	At Brisbane	Won 22 to 0
July 17-v. Toowoomba XVI	At Toowoomba	Won 16 to 0
July 19-v. Ipswitch	At Ipswitch	Won 17 to 5
July 22-v. Queensland	At Brisbane	Won 11 to 7
July 24-v. Toowoomba XVII	At Toowoomba	Won 19 to 0

Played 16: Won 15: Drawn 1: Lost 0:
Points for, 239: Points against, 66:

IN NEW ZEALAND

1888

June 23-v. Hawkes Bay	At Napier	Won 5 to 0
June 30-v Hawkes Bay	At Napier	Won 11 to 0
July 7-v. Auckland	At Auckland	Lost 0 to 9
July 11-v. Nelson	At Nelson	Won 9 to 0
July 14-v. Wellington	At Wellington	Won 3 to 0
July 21-v. Canterbury	At Christchurch	Won 5 to 4
July 24-v. South Canterbury	At Timaru	Won 9 to 0
July 28-v. Otago	At Dunedin	Lost 0 to 8
July 31-v. Otago	At Dunedin	Won 1 to 0

1889

Aug. 7-v. Southland	At Invercargill	Won 5 to 1
Aug. 8-v. Mataura Dist. XVI	At Gore	Won 16 to 3
Aug.10-v. Otago	At Dunedin	Won 11 to 8
Aug.15-v. Hawkes Bay	At Christchurch	Won 13 to 2
Aug.17-v. Canterbury	At Christchurch	Won 15 to 0
Aug.19-v. Wairarapa	At Masterton	Won 10 to 8
Aug.20-v.Wellington	At Wellington	Won 4 to 1

Aug.24-v. Auckland	At Auckland	Lost 2 to 7

Played 17: Won 14: Drawn 0: Lost 3:
Points for, 119: Points against, 51:

Grand Totals: Played 107: Won 78: Drawn 6: Lost 23:
Points for, 772: Points against, 305:

VICTORIAN RULES MATCHES

The following is a record of those matches which can be traced in the Melbourne press. The frequency of matches in relation to those played under rugby rules, suggests that it is complete - as the team left Melbourne after the rugby match against Victoria on 10 June.

May 15-v. Maryborough	At Maryborough	Lost 1/2 to 6/9
May 18-v. Ballarat	At Ballarat	Lost 0/4 to 4/2
May 25-v. Melbourne	At Carlton	Lost2/4 to13/16
May 28-v. Wanderers	At Melbourne	Won 10/11 to2/3
May 30-v. South Melbourne	At Melbourne	Won 6/4 to 4/13
June 1-v. St Kilda	At Melbourne	Lost 1/6 to 6/7
June 6-v. Daylesford	At Daylesford	Won 2/4 to 1/5
June 8 -v. Essendon	At Melbourne	Lost 5/5to11/14

Played 8: Won 3: Drawn 0: Lost 5:

APPENDIX THREE

Individual Record.

APPEARANCES.

In many cases the figures provided here indicate only a minimum number of appearances. The team lists for six matches in Britain and five in Australia are either incomplete or non existent. The matches are, Britain -v. East Cumberland. -v. Brighouse Rangers. -v. Taunton. -v. Leigh. -v. Barrow and District. -v. St Helen's: Australia -v. Navy XVIII. -v. Victoria. -v. Parramatta and King's School XVIII. -v. Arfoma. -v. Permanent Artillery XVIII.

	Britain.	Australia.	New Zealand.	Total.
W. Elliot	63	10	13	86
R.G. Taiaroa	59	9	17	85
T.R. Ellison	58	9	16	83
D.R. Gage	68	1	13	82
G.A. Williams	53	8	14	75
W.T. Wynyard	52	8	15	75
P. Keogh	60	9	1	70
Art Warbrick.	46	8	13	67
E. McCausland	63	1	2	66
F. Warbrick	41	10	14	65
G. Wynyard	43	9	11	63
H. Lee	50	7	5	62
W. Warbrick	36	6	17	59
W. Anderson	48	5	5	58
T. Rene	34	7	14	55
R. Maynard	38	7	9	54
D. Stewart	40	4	8	52

W. Karauria	43	2	5	50
C. Madigan	32	8	10	50
A. Webster	37	1	7	45
C. Goldsmith	20	5	10	35
E. Ihimaira	14	2	7	23
H. Wynyard	14	2	6	22
J. Warbrick	14	2	5	21
W. Nehua	8	3	7	18
Alf Warbrick	4	4	8	16

SCORING

IN BRITISH ISLES

	T.	C.	PG.	M	DG.	Tl.
E. McCausland	2	64	3	2	2	151
W.T. Wynyard	23	-	-	-	7	44
T.R. Ellison	23	6	1	-	-	38
P. Keogh	34	-	-	-	-	34
W. Elliot	21	-	-	-	-	21
G.A. Williams	12	4	-	-	-	20
D.R. Gage	13	-	-	-	2	19
E. Ihimaira	8	-	-	-	-	8
C. Madigan	7	-	-	-	-	7
F. Warbrick	5	1	-	-	-	7
W. Karauria	6	-	-	-	-	6
H. Lee	6	-	-	-	-	6
Art. Warbrick	5	-	-	-	-	5
W. Warbrick	5	-	-	-	-	5
D. Stewart	5	-	-	-	-	5
G. Wynyard	4	-	-	-	-	4
R.G. Taiaroa	3	-	-	-	-	3
R. Maynard	2	-	-	-	-	2
H.J. Wynyard	2	-	-	-	-	2
J.A. Warbrick	-	1	-	-	-	2
T. Rene	1	-	-	-	-	1
W. Nehua	1	-	-	-	-	1
C. Goldsmith	1	-	-	-	-	1
W. Anderson	1	-	-	-	-	1
A. Webster	1	-	-	-	-	1
Total.	191	76	4	2	11	394

IN AUSTRALIA

Victoria

	T.	C.	PG.	M	DG.	Tl.
F. Warbrick	3 *	2	-	-	-	9
W.T. Wynyard	1 *	2	-	-	-	7
P. Keogh	4 *	-	-	-	-	6
H. Lee	1	2	-	-	-	5
R. Maynard	1 *	1	-	-	-	5
C Madigan	4	-	-	-	-	4
G.A. Williams	1 *	-	-	-	-	3
T.R. Ellison	1 *	-	-	-	-	3
E. McCausland	-	1	-	-	-	2
Art. Warbrick	1	-	-	-	-	1
E. Ihimaira	1	-	-	-	-	1
W. Nehua	1	-	-	-	-	1
W. Anderson	1	-	-	-	-	1
C. Goldsmith	1	-	-	-	-	1
Total.	21	9	-	-	-	49

* Includes one try which counted three points.

New South Wales

T.R. Ellison	4	1	-	-	-	14
R. Maynard	2	4	-	-	-	14
C. Madigan	4	-	-	-	-	12
G.A. Williams	1	4	-	-	-	11
W.T. Wynyard	3	-	-	-	-	9
W. Warbrick	3	-	-	-	-	9
F. Warbrick	3	-	-	-	-	9
C. Goldsmith	3	-	-	-	-	9
G. Wynyard	2	-	-	-	-	6
H. Lee	2	-	-	-	-	6
P. Keogh	2	-	-	-	-	6
H. Wynyard	1	-	-	-	-	3
R.G. Taiaroa	1	-	-	-	-	3
W. Nehua	1	-	-	-	-	3
D. Stewart	1	-	-	-	-	3
E. McCausland	-	1	-	-	-	2
Total.	35	10	-	-	-	125

Queensland

T.R. Ellison	5	5	-	-	-	25
F. Warbrick	2	2	-	-	-	10
P. Keogh	4	-	-	-	-	8
W.T. Wynyard	2	-	-	-	1	8
W. Elliot	3	-	-	-	-	6
R. Maynard	1	1	-	-	-	5
C. Madigan	2	-	-	-	-	4

H. Lee	2	-	-	-	-	4
W. Nehua	-	1	-	-	-	3
H.C. Speakman*	1	-	-	-	-	2
C. Goldsmith	1	-	-	-	-	2
Art. Warbrick	1	-	-	-	-	2
Alf Warbrick	1	-	-	-	-	2
G.A. Williams	1	-	-	-	-	2.
W. Warbrick	1	-	-	-	-	2
Total.	27	9	-	-	1	85

*Speakman, a member of the 1888 British team who settled in Queensland, played in the second Toowoomba match.

NEW ZEALAND

	T.	C.	PG.	M	DG.	Tl.
T.R. Ellison	10	10	-	1	-	33
W.T. Wynyard	7	1	-	1	1	15
D.R. Gage	5	-	-	-	2	11
W. Elliot	10	-	-	-	-	10
F. Warbrick	5	2	-	-	-	9
J. Warbrick	1	2	-	1	-	8
C Goldsmith	4	-	-	-	-	4
E. Ihimaira	4	-	-	-	-	4
W. Nehua	-	2	-	-	-	4
R.G. Taiaroa	4	-	-	-	-	4
W. Warbrick	4	-	-	-	-	4
G.A. Williams	2	1	-	-	-	4
Alf Warbrick	3	-	-	-	-	3
R. Maynard	2	-	-	-	-	2
P. Keogh	1	-	-	-	-	1
C. Madigan	1	-	-	-	-	1
T. Rene	1	-	-	-	-	1
H. Wynyard	1	-	-	-	-	1
Total.	65	18	-	3	3	119

In the British Isles tries counted one point: conversions two points: all other goals three points.

In Victoria tries counted one point: conversions two points: all other goals three points.

In New South Wales tries counted three points: conversions two points: dropped goals four points.

In Queensland tries counted two points: conversions three points: dropped goals four points.

In New Zealand tries counted one point: conversions two points: dropped goals and goals from Marks three points.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

The single greatest obstacle to successfully interpreting the Native tour is a lack of reliable primary material - and especially that emanating from the players. Although Eyton suggests that a number of diaries were kept during the tour, only that by Wiri Nehua has survived. Written in Maori, and currently being translated at La Trobe University, Melbourne, it has been described as little more than a chronological "trip book". It was not available to the author. Beyond it, there are only a few rather anecdotal paragraphs in Tom Ellison's The Art of Rugby Football, and short extracts from Joe Warbrick, George Williams and Pie Wynyard in Thomas Eyton's tour book. With the exception of valuable biographical enquiries by Rod Chester, all secondary writing on the tour is derived from Eyton, Ellison and the statistical records compiled by Arthur Swan, and thus has little new to offer.

As all of Joe Warbrick's personal papers were destroyed by fire in 1893, the task of writing an account of the tour fell to Eyton - who did so in response to "numerous enquiries". Judging by certain inclusions which are less than favourable to the team, such as the Middlesex champagne incident, the arrest

of a player in Belfast and the Brisbane affair, Rugby Football Past and Present can be regarded as an honest and revealing account of the tour. It does not, however, reinforce many of its leading statements with substantial detail, and is particularly sparse in its coverage of the crucial periods of the tour in New Zealand.

As discussed in chapter three, the newspaper sources used here have obvious limitations. Beyond explanations for the limited focus of many smaller communities, and the ever present dilemma of the extent to which any press source adequately reflects, or creates, public opinions, there are several practical considerations relating to restricted communication networks. Within Britain, the once weekly or bi-weekly publication of many smaller newspapers placed an obvious premium on what they chose to include - in this case generally little more than relevant match reports. Also, a lack of anything more rapid than the post or expensive telegrams, and the absence of any equivalent to the modern travelling media circus which generally accompanies touring sports teams, further restricted press content. And these restrictions apply even more to the New Zealand press - both internally and in their communication with Britain. Beyond very brief telegrams, all of the tour reports were shipped to New Zealand and took a minimum of six or seven weeks to arrive. Moreover, the vast majority of them were direct reprints of existing British reports. Apparently only the *Lyttelton Times* had individual access to a correspondent in fairly regular contact with the Native team. But the identity of this source can not be established.

Although a relatively small number of press sources has been cited in the text, the full list of more than seventy that were consulted is essential to understanding the construction of arguments based on omissions which are central to questions of race, imperialism and sportsmanship in the north/south dichotomy operating throughout this thesis. Only when one appreciates fully what the northern press did not publish, can an accurate judgement be made as to the impact and wider relevance of views expressed in London.

NEWSPAPERS

All are for the period 1888-1889 unless otherwise stated.

New Zealand

Auckland Weekly News
Canterbury Times
Hawkes Bay Herald
Lyttelton Times
New Zealand Freelance (1926)
New Zealand Herald
Otago Daily Times
Otago Witness
The New Zealand Referee
The Press
Weekly Press

London

Illustrated London News
Illustrated Sporting and Dramatic News
Sporting Clipper
Sporting World
The Daily Telegraph
The Field
The Mail
The Sporting Life
The Sportsman
The Times

Lancashire, Cheshire

Barrow News
Liverpool Daily Post
Liverpool Echo
Manchester City News
Manchester Evening News
Oldham Chronicle
St Helen's Reporter
Stockport Echo
The Athletic News (Manchester)
The Evening Chronicle (Oldham)
The Manchester Guardian
The Rochdale Times
The Runcorn Guardian
The Warrington Examiner
Widnes Examiner

Yorkshire

Dewsbury Reporter
Huddersfield Daily Examiner
Hull Daily Mail
Leeds Daily News
Leeds Evening Express
The Batley News
The Batley Reporter and Guardian
The Bradford Daily Telegraph
The Bradford Observer
The Halifax Courier
The Leeds Mercury
The Wakefield Echo
The Wakefield Express

Midlands, Northumberland, Cumbria, Somerset, Devonshire

Birmingham Daily Mail
Birmingham Daily Post
Burton News and Standard
Maryport Advertiser and Weekly News
Newcastle Daily Chronicle
Newcastle Journal
Newcastle Weekly Chronicle
Northern Daily Mail (Hartlepool)
Somerset County Herald
Sport and Play (Birmingham)
The Devon Evening Express
The Western Times (Exeter)

Gloucester, Oxford, Cambridge

Cambridge Daily News
Cambridge University Reporter
Gloucester Standard and Gloucestershire News
Oxford University Herald

Wales

The Cambria Daily Leader (Swansea)
The Cambrian (Swansea)

Australia

The Age
The Bulletin
The Melbourne Argus
The Sydney Morning Herald

SECONDARY SOURCES

Contemporary Works

Ellison, T. R. The Art of Rugby Football. Wellington 1902.

Eyton, T. Rugby Football (Past and Present) and The Tour of the Native Team in Britain, Australia & New Zealand in 1888-89. Palmerston North 1896.

Books

Auckland Rugby Football Union. Rugby in Auckland 1883-1967. Auckland 1968.

Bolt, C. Victorian Attitudes to Race. London 1971.

Chapman, J.H. ed Otago Rugby Football Union Annual 1888/1889. Dunedin 1889 and 1890.

Chester, R.H., N.A.C. McMillan. The Encyclopedia of New Zealand Rugby. Auckland 1981.

_____ . The Visitors: The History of International Rugby Teams in New Zealand. Auckland 1990.

Collins, W.J.T. Rugby Reflections. Newport 1948.

Dixon, G. The Triumphant Tour of the New Zealand Footballers. Wellington 1906.

Dobbs, B. Edwardians At Play: Sport 1890-1914. London 1973.

Dunning, E., K. Sheard. Barbarians,Gentlemen and Players: A Sociological Study of the Development of Rugby Football. Canberra 1979.

Gate, R. Rugby League: An Illustrated History. London 1989.

Griffiths, J. The Book of English International Rugby. London 1982.

Holt, R. Sport and the British. Oxford 1989.

Hunter, I. Rugby Football: Some Hints and Criticisms. Auckland 1929.

Jones, S.G. Sport, Politics and the Working Class. Manchester 1988.

Kohere, R.T. Autobiography of a Maori. Wellington 1951.

McCarthy, W. Haka: The All Black Story. London 1968.

_____ . Haka: The Maori Rugby Story, Auckland 1983.

McIntosh, P. Fair Play: Ethics in Sport and Education. London 1979.

Mackrell, B. Hariru Wikitoria. Auckland 1985.

Macrory, J. Running with the Ball: The Birth of Rugby Football. London 1991.

Mandle, W.F. Going it Alone: Australia's National Identity in the Twentieth Century. Ringwood, Vic. 1977.

Mangan, J.A. Athleticism in the Victorian and Edwardian Public School. Cambridge 1981.

_____ . ed. Pleasure, Profit, Proselytism: British Culture and Sport at Home and Abroad 17000-1914. London 1987.

Mason, T. ed. Sport in Britain: A Social History. Cambridge 1989.

Mason, T. Sport in Britain. London 1988.

O'Hagan, S. The Pride of Southern Rebels. Dunedin 1981.

Phillips, J.O.C. A Man's Country. Auckland 1987.

Pollard, J. Australian Cricket: The Game and the Players. North Ryde, New South Wales 1982.

Reed, W.A. 100 Years of Rugby. Nelson 1969.

Reyburn, W.M. A History of Rugby. London 1971.

Rich, P. Race and Empire in British Politics. New York 1986.

Saunders, L. The Canterbury Rugby History. Christchurch 1979.

Scholefield, G.H. ed. Dictionary of New Zealand Biography. Wellington 1940.

Sinclair, K. A Destiny Apart. Wellington 1986.

Slatter, G. On the Ball. Christchurch 1970.

Smith, D., G. Williams. Fields of Praise: The Official History of the Welsh Rugby Union 1881-1981. Cardiff 1980.

Swan, A.C. History of New Zealand Rugby Football 1870-1945. Wellington 1948.

_____., G.F.W. Jackson. Wellington's Rugby History, Wellington 1952.

Tatz, C. Aborigines in Sport. Bedford Park, South Australia 1987.

Tyro, K., K. Scarlett. Te Aute College 125th Anniversary 1854-1979. Pukehou 1979.

Wiener, M.J. English Culture and the Decline of the Industrial Spirit, 1850-1980. Cambridge 1981.

Wynne-Thomas, P. "Give me Arthur": A Biography of Arthur Shrewsbury. London 1985.

Articles

Inglis, K.S. " Imperial Cricket: Test Matches Between Australia and England, 1877-1900 ", in R. Cashman & McKernan. eds Sport in History. St Lucia 1979.

J.G.M. " Greatest Tour in Rugby History ", *New Zealand Sportsman*, June 1949.

Mackrell, B. " A Long History of Welsh-Maori Competition ", *The Dominion*, 1 October 1982.

Mandle, W.F. " The Professional Cricketer in England in the Nineteenth century ", Labour History, Nov. 1972.

_____ . " W.G. Grace as a Victorian Hero ", Historical Studies. April 1981.

Nauright, J. "Myth and Reality: Reflections on Rugby and New Zealand Historiography", Sporting Traditions, Vol.6, No.2, May 1990.

Palenski, R. " Natives Tour Grandest of All ", *Dominion Sunday Times*, 13 October 1988, p.57.

Sinclair, J. " New Zealand Rugby Museum Newsletter ", Palmerston North, October 1988.

Swan, A.C. " Makers of History: The 1888-89 N.Z. Native Team " *Silver Fern*, 1,8,15,22 July 1965.

"The Pathfinders ", Scotland v. New Zealand Test Programme, Dunedin 1990.

Theses and Research Essays

Buchanan, T.M.W., " Missionaries of Empire: 1905 All Black Tour", Research Essay, University of Canterbury 1981.

Horton, P.R. A History of Rugby Union Football in Queensland 1882-1891. unpub. PhD thesis. University of Queensland 1989.

Lidstone, W. "The Invincibles", Research Essay, University of Canterbury 1991.

P. Murrey, "The origins of rugby football in Christchurch, 1860-1885", Research Essay, University of Canterbury 1983.